

# Continuous-time block-monotone Markov chains and their block-augmented truncations

Hiroyuki Masuyama<sup>†</sup>

Department of Systems Science, Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University  
Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

## Abstract

This paper considers continuous-time block-monotone Markov chains (BMMCs) and their block-augmented truncations. We first introduce the block-monotonicity and block-wise dominance relation for continuous-time Markov chains and then provide some fundamental results on the two notions. Using these results, we show that the stationary probability vectors obtained by the block-augmented truncation converge to the stationary probability vector of the original BMMC. We also show that the last-column-block-augmented truncation of a BMMC provides the best approximation to the stationary probability vector of the BMMC among its all block-augmented truncations. Furthermore, we present computable error bounds for the total variation distance between the stationary probability vectors of a Markov chain and its last-column-block-augmented truncation, under the assumption that the original Markov chain itself may not be block-monotone but is block-wise dominated by a BMMC with exponential ergodicity. Finally, we apply the obtained bounds to a queue with a batch Markovian arrival process (BMAP) and state-dependent departure rates.

**Keywords:** Block-monotone Markov chain (BMMC); Block-augmented truncation; Last-column-block-augmented truncation (LC-block-augmented truncation); GI/G/1-type Markov chain; Level-dependent quasi-birth-and-death process (LD-QBD); Exponential ergodicity

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 60J27; 60J22; 60K25.

## 1 Introduction

This paper considers continuous-time block-structured Markov chains characterized by an infinite number of block matrices, such as GI/G/1-type Markov chains (including M/G/1- and GI/M/1-type ones) [14, 22, 4] and level-dependent quasi-birth-and-death processes (LD-QBDs) [14]. It is, in general, difficult to calculate the stationary probability vectors of such Markov chains. A simple and practical solution to this problem is to adopt the *augmented northwest-corner truncations* of the infinitesimal generators and the transition probability matrices in order to compute the stationary probability vectors of continuous-time and discrete-time Markov

---

<sup>†</sup>E-mail: masuyama@sys.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

chains [9, 8]. Naturally, the stationary probability vector obtained by the augmented northwest-corner truncation is an *approximation* to the original stationary probability vector. Therefore, it is important to estimate the error caused by the augmented northwest-corner truncation.

In fact, such error estimation is facilitated by using the (stochastic) monotonicity of Markov chains (see, e.g., [7]). Indeed, it is shown [8, Theorem 1] that the *last-column-augmented northwest-corner truncation* (*last-column-augmented truncation, for short*) yields the *best* approximation to the stationary probability vector of a discrete-time monotone Markov chain, in a certain sense. In addition, there have been some studies on the estimate of the total variation distance between the stationary probability vectors of the original Markov chain and its last-column-augmented truncation. Tweedie [24] assumed that the original Markov chain is monotone and geometrically ergodic, and then derived a computable upper bound. Liu [16] presented such a bound, assuming the monotonicity and the subgeometric ergodicity of the original Markov chain. Without the monotonicity, Hervé and Ledoux [10] developed an upper bound with the geometric ergodicity of the original Markov chain, though the bound includes the second largest eigenvalue of the last-column-augmented truncation. Therefore, Ledoux [10]’s bound is not easy to compute, compared with the bounds presented by Tweedie [24] and Liu [16].

We have seen that the monotonicity is useful for the error estimate of the augmented northwest-corner truncations. However, the monotonicity is a somewhat strong restriction on block-structured Markov chains. Thus, Li and Zhao [15] introduced the block-monotonicity of discrete-time block-structured Markov chains. The block-monotonicity is an extension of the monotonicity to block-structured Markov chains. Li and Zhao [15] also proved (see Theorem 3.6 therein) that the *last-column-block-augmented northwest-corner truncation* (*called LC-block-augmented truncation, for short*) yields the best approximation to the stationary probability vector of the block-monotone Markov chain (BMMC) among all the *block-augmented northwest-corner truncations* (*called block-augmented truncations, for short*). Masuyama [18, 19] presented computable upper bounds for the total variation distance between the stationary probability vectors of the original BMMC and its LC-block-augmented truncation in the respective cases where the original BMMC satisfies the geometric drift condition and the subgeometric drift condition. The bounds presented in [18, 19] are the generalization of those in [24, 16].

The existing results reviewed above are established for discrete-time BMMCs. These results can be applied to continuous-time Markov chains with bounded infinitesimal generators by the uniformization technique [23, Section 4.5.2]. As for the continuous-time case, Zeifman et al. [28] presented an error bound for the periodic stationary distribution obtained by the truncation of a periodic and exponentially weakly ergodic non-time-homogeneous birth-and-death process with bounded transition rates (see also [27, 26]). Hart and Tweedie [9] provided some sets of conditions, under which the stationary probability vectors of the augmented northwest-corner truncations of a continuous-time monotone (not block-monotone) Markov chain converge to the stationary probability vector of the original Markov chain.

In this paper, we consider continuous-time block-structured Markov chains with possibly unbounded infinitesimal generators. We first provide fundamental results on the block

monotonicity and block-wise dominance relation for continuous-time block-structured Markov chains. Next, we present the definition of the block-augmented truncation and the LC-block-augmented truncation of continuous-time block-structured Markov chains. We then prove that the LC-block-augmented truncation of a BMMC is the best among all the block-augmented truncations of the BMMC. We also present computable upper bounds for the total variation distance between the stationary probability vectors of a block-structured Markov chain and its LC-block-augmented truncation, under the assumption that the original Markov chain is block-wise dominated by a BMMC with exponential ergodicity. Finally, we apply the obtained bounds to the queue length process of a queue with a batch Markovian arrival process (BMAP) [17] and state-dependent departure rates.

The rest of this paper is divided into five sections. Section 2 introduces basic definitions and notation. Section 3 provides fundamental results associated with continuous-time BMMCs. Section 4 discusses the block-augmented truncations. Section 5 presents error bounds for the stationary probability vector obtained by the LC-block-augmented truncation. Section 6 applies the error bounds to a queueing model.

## 2 Basic definitions and notation

Let  $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  and  $\overline{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Furthermore, let  $\mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N} = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$  and  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq N} = \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N} \times \mathbb{D}$  for  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\mathbb{D} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ . Note here that  $\mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq \infty} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ . For simplicity, we write  $\mathbb{F}$  for  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq \infty}$ .

We define  $\mathbf{I}_d$  as the  $d \times d$  identity matrix. We may write  $\mathbf{I}$  for the identity matrix when its order is clear from the context. We also define  $\mathbf{O}$  as the zero matrix. Furthermore, let  $\mathbf{T}_d := \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq \infty}$  denote

$$\mathbf{T}_d = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N}$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , denote an  $|\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}| \times |\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}|$  northwest-corner truncation of  $\mathbf{T}_d$ , where  $|\cdot|$  denotes set cardinality. It is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ -\mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{O} & -\mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & -\mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{I}_d & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and that  $(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N})^{-1}$  is equal to an  $|\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}| \times |\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}|$  northwest-corner truncation of  $\mathbf{T}_d^{-1}$ .

We now introduce the definitions associated with the block monotonicity and block-wise dominance relation for probability vectors and stochastic matrices.

**Definition 2.1** For  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ , let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  denote probability vectors with block size  $d$ . The vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is said to be (stochastically) block-wise dominated by  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  (denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \prec_d \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ) if  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N} \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N}$ .

**Definition 2.2 (Definition 1.1 and Proposition 2.1, [18])** For any  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ , a stochastic matrix  $\mathbf{P} = (p(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  and Markov chains characterized by  $\mathbf{P}$  are said to be (stochastically) block-monotone with block size  $d$  if  $(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N} \geq \mathbf{O}$ , or equivalently, if

$$\sum_{m=l}^N p(k, i; m, j) \leq \sum_{m=l}^N p(k+1, i; m, j), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N-1}, (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}.$$

The set of block-monotone stochastic matrices with block size  $d$  is denoted by  $\text{BM}_d$ .

**Definition 2.3** For any  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ , a stochastic matrix  $\mathbf{P} = (p(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  is said to be (stochastically) block-wise dominated by another stochastic matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = (\tilde{p}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  (denoted by  $\mathbf{P} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ ) if  $\mathbf{P} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N} \leq \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N}$ .

**Definition 2.4 (Definition 2.1, [15])** For  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ , a column vector  $\mathbf{f} = (f(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  is said to be block-increasing with block size  $d$  if  $(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq N})^{-1} \mathbf{f} \geq \mathbf{0}$ , i.e.,  $f(k, i) \leq f(k+1, i)$  for all  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N-1} \times \mathbb{D}$ . The set of column vectors block-increasing with block size  $d$  by  $\text{Bl}_d$ .

The following is a basic result on block-monotone stochastic matrices.

**Proposition 2.1 (Proposition 2.2, [18])** *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\mathbf{P} \in \text{BM}_d$ ;
- (b)  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{P} \prec_d \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathbf{P}$  for any two probability vectors  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \prec_d \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ; and
- (c)  $\mathbf{P} \mathbf{f} \in \text{Bl}_d$  for any  $\mathbf{f} \in \text{Bl}_d$ .

### 3 Block-monotone continuous-time Markov chains

In this section, we first provide the basic assumption and characterization of a continuous-time block-structured Markov chain. We then describe the block monotonicity and block-wise dominance relation for the infinitesimal generators of continuous-time block-structured Markov chains. We also present some fundamental results on the block monotonicity and block-wise dominance relation.

#### 3.1 Block-structured Markov chains

Let  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$  denote a continuous-time Markov chain with state space  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$ , where  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ . Let  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)} = (p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  denote the *transition matrix function* of  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$ , i.e.,

$$p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j) = \mathbb{P}(X_t = l, J_t = j \mid X_0 = k, J_0 = i), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.1)$$

It is known that

$$\mathbf{P}^{(t+s)} = \mathbf{P}^{(t)} \mathbf{P}^{(s)} = \mathbf{P}^{(s)} \mathbf{P}^{(t)}, \quad t, s \geq 0, \quad (3.2)$$

which is called the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation [5, Chapter 8, Section 2.1].

We assume that  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}$  is *continuous (or standard)*, i.e.,  $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} = \mathbf{I}$  (see [5, Chapter 8, Section 2.2] and [1, Definition at p. 5]). It then follows from [1, Section 1.2, Proposition 2.2] that, for all  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$ ,  $q_{(k,i)} := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} (1 - p^{(t)}(k, i; k, i))/t \geq 0$  exists and is possibly infinite. We assume that

$$q_{(k,i)} < \infty \quad \text{for all } (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N},$$

that is, all the states in  $\mathbb{F}$  are *stable* [1, Definition at p. 9]. Thus, it follows from [1, Section 1.2, Proposition 2.4 and Corollary 2.5] that  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}$  satisfies the Kolmogorov forward differential equation (3.3) and the backward differential equation (3.4):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} = \mathbf{P}^{(t)} \mathbf{Q}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P}^{(t)}, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{Q} := (q_{(k,i;l,j)})_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  is a matrix whose elements are all finite, which is given by

$$\mathbf{Q} = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{P}^{(t)} - \mathbf{I}}{t}. \quad (3.5)$$

Note here that  $q_{(k,i)} = |Q(k, i; k, i)| < \infty$  for all  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$ . The matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  is called the *infinitesimal generator* [5, Chapter 8, Definition 2.3] or the *Q-matrix* [1, Definition at p. 13] of the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$  and the transition matrix function  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}$ . For further discussion, we assume that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is *conservative* [1, Definition at p. 13], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}$  is a column vector of 1's. The assumptions made above are summarized as follows:

**Assumption 3.1** (i)  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}$  is continuous; and (ii)  $\mathbf{Q}$  is stable and conservative.

In the rest of this paper, Assumption 3.1 is satisfied.

We now mention an important notion for infinitesimal generators (or  $\mathbf{Q}$ -matrices). The matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  is said to be *regular* if the equation

$$\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x} = \gamma \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e} \quad (3.7)$$

has no nontrivial solution for some (and thus all)  $\gamma > 0$  (see [5, Chapter 8, Theorem 4.4] and [1, Section 2.2, Theorem 2.7]). In fact,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is regular if and only if  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$  is a regular-jump process [5, Chapter 8, Definition 2.5]. Furthermore, if  $\mathbf{Q}$  is regular, then Assumption 3.1 holds [5, Chapter 8, Definition 2.4 and Theorem 3.4] and thus  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)} \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $\{\mathbf{P}^{(t)}\}$  is the unique solution of both equations (3.3) and (3.4) [1, Corollary 2.5 and Theorem 2.7 of Section 2.2 and Definition at p. 81].

**Remark 3.1** If  $Q$  is bounded [23, Section 4.5.2], then

$$P^{(t)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(Qt)^m}{m!} = \exp\{Qt\}.$$

For later discussion, we introduce the definition of a stationary probability vector (or stationary distribution) of the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$ .

**Definition 3.1** Let  $\pi = (\pi(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  denote a probability vector such that

$$\pi P^{(t)} = \pi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

The vector  $\pi$  is called a *stationary probability vector (or stationary distribution)* of the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  and the transition matrix function  $P^{(t)}$  (see [1, Definition at pp. 159–160]).

**Remark 3.2** Suppose that the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  and thus  $Q$  are irreducible. It then holds that  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  and  $Q$  are positive recurrent if and only if there exists a stationary probability vector of  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  and  $P^{(t)}$  [1, Section 5.1, Proposition 1.7]. Furthermore, it is known [1, Section 5.4, Theorem 4.5] that if  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  is ergodic (i.e., irreducible and positive recurrent) then its stationary probability vector  $\pi$  satisfies

$$\pi Q = 0, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P^{(t)} = e\pi, \tag{3.9}$$

and (3.9) implies that  $\pi$  is the unique stationary probability vector.

**Remark 3.3** If  $Q$  is ergodic, then  $Q$  is regular. Indeed, suppose that  $Q$  is ergodic but is not regular. Under this assumption, the equation (3.7) has a nontrivial solution  $x \geq 0, \neq 0$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Pre-multiplying (3.7) by  $\pi$  and using (3.8), we have  $\gamma = 0$ , which yields a contradiction. Consequently, the ergodicity of  $Q$  implies that  $Q$  is regular.

### 3.2 Block monotonicity and block-wise dominance for infinitesimal generators

In this subsection, we present the fundamental results on the block monotonicity and block-wise dominance for  $|\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}| \times |\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}|$  infinitesimal generators ( $Q$ -matrices), where  $N \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ . To this end, we introduce another Markov chain  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t); t \geq 0\}$  with state space  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$  and infinitesimal generator  $\tilde{Q} := (\tilde{q}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$ . We also define  $\tilde{P}^{(t)} := (\tilde{p}^{(t)}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  as the transition matrix function of the Markov chain  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\}$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{p}^{(t)}(k, i; l, j) = P(\tilde{X}_t = l, \tilde{J}_t = j \mid \tilde{X}_0 = k, \tilde{J}_0 = i), \quad t \geq 0.$$

We now provide the definition of the block monotonicity and block-wise dominance.

**Definition 3.2** The infinitesimal generator  $Q$  and Markov chains characterized by  $Q$  are said to be (stochastically) block-monotone with block size  $d$  (denoted by  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$ ) if

$$\sum_{m=l}^N q(k-1, i; m, j) \leq \sum_{m=l}^N q(k, i; m, j), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}, (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N} \setminus \{(k, i)\},$$

where  $q(-1, i; l, j) = 0$  for  $l \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ .

**Definition 3.3** The infinitesimal generator  $Q$  is said to be (stochastically) block-wise dominated by  $\tilde{Q}$  (denoted by  $Q \prec_d \tilde{Q}$ ) if  $QT_d^{\leq N} \leq \tilde{Q}T_d^{\leq N}$ .

In what follows, we present five lemmas: Lemmas 3.1–3.5. For the respective lemmas, we give the proofs in the case where  $N = \infty$  only, because we can similarly prove the lemmas in the case where  $N < \infty$ .

**Lemma 3.1** If  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$ , then (a)  $\xi(i, j) := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N}} q(k, i; l, j)$  is constant with respect to  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N}$ ; and (b)  $\Xi = (\xi(i, j))_{i, j \in \mathbb{D}}$  is the infinitesimal generator of the Markov chain  $\{J_t; t \geq 0\}$ .

*Proof.* We first prove statement (a). Since  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$ , we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k+1, i; l, j) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Combining this and (3.6) yields

$$0 = \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} q(k, i; l, j) \leq \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} q(k+1, i; l, j) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

which implies that  $\xi(i, j) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j)$  is constant with respect to  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

Next, we prove statement (b). Let  $p_k^{(t)}(i, j) = P(J_t = j \mid X_0 = k, J_0 = i)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ . It then follows from (3.1) that

$$p_k^{(t)}(i, j) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, i, j \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (3.10)$$

Since  $P^{(t+s)} = P^{(s)}P^{(t)}$  (from (3.2)) and  $P^{(t)}e \leq e$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} \frac{|p^{(t+s)}(k, i; l, j) - p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j)|}{s} \\ & \leq \frac{1 - p^{(s)}(k, i; k, i)}{s} p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j) + \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{(k, i)\}} \frac{p^{(s)}(k, i; l', j')}{s} p^{(t)}(l', j'; l, j) \\ & \leq \frac{2(1 - p^{(s)}(k, i; k, i))}{s} \\ & \leq 2|q(k, i; k, i)|, \quad t \geq 0, s > 0, (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where the last inequality holds due to [6, Theorem II.3.1]. Furthermore, it follows from (3.10) and (3.11) that, for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $s > 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|p_k^{(t+s)}(i, j) - p_k^{(t)}(i, j)|}{s} \\ & \leq \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} \frac{|p^{(t+s)}(k, i; l, j) - p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j)|}{s} \\ & \leq 2q(k, i; k, i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining (3.5), (3.10) and the dominated convergence theorem yields, for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} p_k^{(t)}(i, j) = \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{p_k^{(t+s)}(i, j) - p_k^{(t)}(i, j)}{s} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j) = \xi(i, j),$$

which implies that

$$P(J_t = j \mid X_0 = k, J_0 = i) = p_k^{(t)}(i, j) = [\exp\{\Xi t\}]_{i,j}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $[\cdot]_{i,j}$  denotes the  $(i, j)$ th element of the  $|\mathbb{D}| \times |\mathbb{D}|$  matrix in the square brackets. From (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(J_t = j \mid J_0 = i) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [\exp\{\Xi t\}]_{i,j} P(X_0 = k \mid J_0 = i) \\ &= [\exp\{\Xi t\}]_{i,j}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{D}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that  $\Xi$  is the infinitesimal generator of the Markov chain  $\{J(t); t \geq 0\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2** *If  $Q$  is regular, then the following are equivalent: (a)  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$ ; and (b)  $P^{(t)} \in \text{BM}_d$ , i.e.,  $(T_d^{\leq N})^{-1} P^{(t)} T_d^{\leq N} \geq O$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Before the proof of this lemma, we introduce some symbols. Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $t_n = \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t \geq n\}$ . Since the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  is regular,

$$P(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \infty) = 1. \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, we define  $\{(X_t^{\leq n}, J_t^{\leq n}); t \geq 0\}$  as a Markov chain with state space  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$  such that

$$X_t^{\leq n} = \begin{cases} X_t, & 0 \leq t < t_n, \\ n, & t \geq t_n, \end{cases} \quad J_t^{\leq n} = J_t, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

We also define  $\mathbf{Q}^{\leq n} = (q^{\leq n}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}}$  as the infinitesimal generator of  $\{(X_t^{\leq n}, J_t^{\leq n})\}$ . It then follows that, for  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$q^{\leq n}(k, i; l, j) = \begin{cases} q(k, i; l, j), & k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq n-1}, \\ \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} q(k, i; m, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq n-1}, l = n, \\ \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} q(n, i; m, j) = \xi(i, j), & k = l = n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Furthermore, let  $p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j)$  denote

$$p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j) = \mathbf{P}(X_t^{\leq n} = l, J_t^{\leq n} = j \mid X_0^{\leq n} = k, J_0^{\leq n} = i),$$

for  $t \geq 0$  and  $(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ .

We are now ready for the proof of the present lemma. We first prove that statement (a) implies statement (b). Since  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbf{BM}_d$ , we have

$$\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} q(k-1, i; m, j) \leq \sum_{m=l}^{\infty} q(k, i; m, j), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, (l, j) \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{(k, i)\}, \quad (3.16)$$

where  $q(-1, i; l, j) = 0$  for all  $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ . From (3.16) and (3.15), we also have

$$\sum_{m=l}^n q^{\leq n}(k-1, i; m, j) \leq \sum_{m=l}^n q^{\leq n}(k, i; m, j), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}, (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n} \setminus \{(k, i)\}, \quad (3.17)$$

where  $q^{\leq n}(-1, i; l, j) = 0$  for all  $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq n}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ . The inequality (3.17) implies that all the off-diagonal elements of  $(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n})^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^{\leq n} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n}$  are nonnegative. Thus, we can choose  $\theta_n \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n})^{-1} (\mathbf{I} + \theta_n^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^{\leq n}) \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n} \geq \mathbf{O}$ , which yields

$$(\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n})^{-1} \exp\{\mathbf{Q}^{\leq n} t\} \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\theta_n t} \frac{(\theta_n t)^m}{m!} (\mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n})^{-1} (\mathbf{I} + \theta_n^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^{\leq n})^m \mathbf{T}_d^{\leq n} \geq \mathbf{O}, \quad (3.18)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \geq 0$ . It follows from (3.18) that, for  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n-1}$  and  $(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ ,

$$\sum_{m=l}^n \{p^{\leq n; (t)}(k+1, i; m, j) - p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; m, j)\} \geq 0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.19)$$

It also follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that, for any fixed  $T > 0$ ,  $\{(X_t^{\leq n}, J_t^{\leq n}); 0 \leq t < T\}$  converges to  $\{(X_t, J_t); 0 \leq t < T\}$  with probability one (w.p.1) as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and thus, for each pair of  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $(m, j) \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; m, j) = p(k, i; m, j) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.20)$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem to (3.19) and using (3.20) yield

$$\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} \{p^{(t)}(k+1, i; m, j) - p^{(t)}(k, i; m, j)\} \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F},$$

where  $T > 0$  is arbitrarily fixed. Note here that

$$\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} p^{(t)}(0, i; m, j) \geq 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad i \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

As a result, we obtain  $\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} \mathbf{T}_d \geq \mathbf{O}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Next, we prove that statement (b) implies statement (a). To this end, we consider the following limit

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} (\mathbf{P}^{(t)} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{T}_d}{t},$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} p^{(t)}(0, i; m, j) - \chi_{(0,i)}(l, j)}{t}, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ & \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} p^{(t)}(k, i; m, j) - \sum_{m=l}^{\infty} p^{(t)}(k-1, i; m, j) - \chi_{(k,i)}(l, j)}{t}, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{D}, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from [6, Theorem II.3.1] that

$$1 - p^{(t)}(k, i; k, i) + \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{(k,i)\}} p^{(t)}(k, i; m, j) \leq 2t |q(k, i; k, i)|, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Therefore, using dominated convergence theorem and (3.5), we obtain

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} (\mathbf{P}^{(t)} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{T}_d}{t} = \mathbf{T}_d^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{T}_d.$$

Note here that  $\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} \mathbf{T}_d \geq \mathbf{O}$  (due to statement (b)), which implies that all the off-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{T}_d^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{T}_d$  are nonnegative, i.e.,  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ . Consequently, statement (a) holds.  $\square$

We now make the following assumption, in addition to Assumption 3.1.

**Assumption 3.2** Suppose that  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and either  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$ .

**Lemma 3.3** Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds. It then holds that

$$\xi(l, j) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N}} q(k, i; l, j) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N}} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq N}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{D},$$

which is constant with respect to  $k$ . Furthermore,  $\Xi = (\xi(i, j))_{i,j \in \mathbb{D}}$  is the common infinitesimal generator of the Markov chains  $\{J_t; t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{\tilde{J}_t; t \geq 0\}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from  $QT_d \leq \tilde{Q}T_d$  that

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, i, j \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Using this inequality  $Qe = 0$  and  $\tilde{Q}e \leq 0$ , we have

$$0 = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} q(k, i; l, j) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j) \leq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, i \in \mathbb{D},$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, i, j \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (3.21)$$

Furthermore, since either  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ , Lemma 3.1 implies that either of  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j)$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j)$  is constant with  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . As a result, both sides of (3.21) are constant with respect to  $k$ . The remaining statement is obvious.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4** Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds. Furthermore, if  $\tilde{Q}$  is regular, then

- (a)  $Q$  is regular; and
- (b)  $P^{(t)} \prec_d \tilde{P}^{(t)}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**Remark 3.4** Lemma 3.4 (b) is proved by using Lemma 3.4 (a), and the latter is proved based on Lemma A.2 (a) (where  $N$  is assumed to be finite). Lemma A.2 (a) is proved without Lemma 3.4 (a) or (b) whereas Lemma A.2 (b) (where  $N$  is possibly infinite) is proved by Lemma 3.4 (b). For details, see the proof of Lemma A.2 in Appendix A.

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* We first prove statement (a). Recall here that  $\{(X_t^{\leq n}, J_t^{\leq n}); t \geq 0\}$  is defined from  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$ , as shown in (3.14). Similarly, we define  $\{(\tilde{X}_t^{\leq n}, \tilde{J}_t^{\leq n}); t \geq 0\}$  as a Markov chain with state space  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$  such that

$$\tilde{X}_t^{\leq n} = \begin{cases} \tilde{X}_t, & 0 \leq t < \tilde{t}_n, \\ n, & t \geq \tilde{t}_n, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{J}_t^{\leq n} = \tilde{J}_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $\tilde{t}_n = \inf\{t \geq 0; \tilde{X}_t \geq n\}$ . We also define  $\tilde{P}^{\leq n; (t)} = (\tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\tilde{Q}^{\leq n} = (\tilde{q}^{\leq n}(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  as the transition matrix function and the infinitesimal generator, respectively, of the Markov chain  $\{(\tilde{X}_t^{\leq n}, \tilde{J}_t^{\leq n})\}$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j) &= P(\tilde{X}_t^{\leq n} = l, \tilde{J}_t^{\leq n} = j \mid \tilde{X}_0^{\leq n} = k, \tilde{J}_0^{\leq n} = i), \\ \tilde{q}^{\leq n}(k, i; l, j) &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j) - \chi_{(k, i)}(l, j)}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.22) and Lemma 3.3 that, for  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\tilde{q}^{\leq n}(k, i; l, j) = \begin{cases} \tilde{q}(k, i; l, j), & k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq n-1}, \\ \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \tilde{q}(k, i; m, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\leq n-1}, l = n, \\ \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}(n, i; m, j) = \xi(i, j), & k = l = n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

Combining (3.23), (3.15) and  $\mathbf{Q}T_d \leq \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}T_d$ , we have

$$\mathbf{Q}^{\leq n}T_d^{\leq n} \leq \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{\leq n}T_d^{\leq n}. \quad (3.24)$$

Note here that either  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$  implies either  $\mathbf{Q}^{\leq n} \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{\leq n} \in \text{BM}_d$ . Therefore, according to Lemma A.2 (a), we can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$X_t^{\leq n} \leq \tilde{X}_t^{\leq n}, \quad J_t^{\leq n} = \tilde{J}_t^{\leq n} \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \quad (3.25)$$

given that  $X_0^{\leq n} \leq \tilde{X}_0^{\leq n}$  and  $J_0^{\leq n} = \tilde{J}_0^{\leq n}$ .

We now suppose that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is not regular. Thus, there exist some  $T_\infty \in (0, \infty)$  and  $(k_0, i_0) \in \mathbb{F}$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\cap_{n>k_0} \{t_n \leq T_\infty\} \mid X_0 = k_0, J_0 = i_0) > 0. \quad (3.26)$$

In addition, it follows (3.14), (3.22) and (3.25) that if  $X_0 = \tilde{X}_0 = k_0$  and  $J_0 = \tilde{J}_0 = i_0$  then  $X_0^{\leq n} = \tilde{X}_0^{\leq n} = k_0$  and  $J_0^{\leq n} = \tilde{J}_0^{\leq n} = i_0$  for  $n > k_0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \cap_{n>k_0} \{t_n \leq T_\infty\} &\Rightarrow \cap_{n>k_0} \{X_t^{\leq n} \geq n \text{ for all } t \geq T_\infty\} \\ &\Rightarrow \cap_{n>k_0} \{\tilde{X}_t^{\leq n} \geq n \text{ for all } t \geq T_\infty\} \\ &\Rightarrow \cap_{n>k_0} \{\tilde{t}_n \leq T_\infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (3.26) yields

$$\mathbf{P}(\cap_{n>k_0} \{\tilde{t}_n \leq T_\infty\} \mid X_0 = k_0, J_0 = i_0) > 0,$$

which is inconsistent with the assumption that  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  is regular. As a result,  $\mathbf{Q}$  must be regular.

Next, we prove statement (b). According to statement (a),  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  are regular and thus

$$\mathbf{Q}e = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}e = 0, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \infty) = \mathbf{P}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{t}_n = \infty) = 1. \quad (3.28)$$

It follows from (3.27), (3.15) and (3.23) that  $\mathbf{I} + \theta_n^{-1}\mathbf{Q}^{\leq n}$  and  $\mathbf{I} + \theta_n^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{\leq n}$  are stochastic, where

$$\theta_n = \max_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} \max (|q^{\leq n}(k, i; k, i)|, |\tilde{q}^{\leq n}(k, i; k, i)|) < \infty.$$

It also follows from (3.24) and [18, Proposition 2.3 (b)] that

$$(I + \theta_n^{-1} Q^{\leq n})^m T_d^{\leq n} \leq (I + \theta_n^{-1} \tilde{Q}^{\leq n})^m T_d^{\leq n}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

which leads to

$$\exp\{Q^{\leq n} t\} T_d^{\leq n} \leq \exp\{\tilde{Q}^{\leq n} t\} T_d^{\leq n}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.29)$$

Note that  $p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j)$  and  $\tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j)$  are equal to the  $(k, i; l, j)$ th elements of  $\exp\{Q^{\leq n} t\}$  and  $\exp\{\tilde{Q}^{\leq n} t\}$ , respectively. Therefore, from (3.29), we have

$$\sum_{m=l}^n \{ \tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; m, j) - p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; m, j) \} \geq 0, \quad t \geq 0, (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}. \quad (3.30)$$

Furthermore, combining (3.28), (3.14) and (3.22), we obtain, for any fixed  $T > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j) = p^{(t)}(k, i; l, j), \quad t \in [0, T], (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \quad (3.31)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{p}^{\leq n; (t)}(k, i; l, j) = \tilde{p}^{(t)}(k, i; l, j), \quad t \in [0, T], (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \quad (3.32)$$

Applying (3.31), (3.32) and the dominated convergence theorem to (3.30) yields

$$\sum_{m=l}^{\infty} \{ \tilde{p}^{(t)}(k, i; m, j) - p^{(t)}(k, i; m, j) \} \geq 0, \quad t \in [0, T], (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Letting  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality, we have  $P^{(t)} T_d \leq \tilde{P}^{(t)} T_d$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5** *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds. Furthermore, suppose that  $\tilde{Q}$  is regular and irreducible.*

- (a) *If  $\tilde{Q}$  is recurrent, then  $Q$  has exactly one recurrent communicating class  $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$  that includes the states  $\{(0, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$ , which is reachable from all the other states w.p.1.*
- (b) *If  $\tilde{Q}$  is positive recurrent, then the communicating class  $\mathbb{C}$  is positive recurrent and  $\pi \prec_d \tilde{\pi}$ , where  $\pi := (\pi(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  and  $\tilde{\pi} := (\tilde{\pi}(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  are the unique stationary probability vectors of  $Q$  and  $\tilde{Q}$ , respectively.*

**Remark 3.5** An irreducible infinitesimal generator of a finite order is ergodic [5, Theorems 3.3 and 5.2 and Definitions 5.1 and 5.2] and thus is regular (see Remark 3.3). Therefore, if Assumption 3.2 holds for  $N < \infty$  and  $\tilde{Q}$  is irreducible, then statement (b) of Lemma 3.5 is true.

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* We first prove statement (a). According Lemma A.2, we assume, without loss of generality, that  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t); t \geq 0\}$  are pathwise ordered as follows:

$$X_t \leq \tilde{X}_t, \quad J_t = \tilde{J}_t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (3.33)$$

It follows from (3.33) and the irreducibility and recurrence of the Markov chain  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\}$  that the Markov chain  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  can reach any state in  $\{(0, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$  from all the states in the state space  $\mathbb{F}$  w.p.1. Therefore,  $\mathbf{Q}$  has exactly one recurrent communicating class  $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathbb{C} \supseteq \{(0, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$ .

Next, we prove statement (b). To this end, we additionally assume that  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and thus  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\}$  are positive recurrent (i.e., ergodic), under which  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  has the unique stationary probability vector  $\tilde{\pi}$  (see Remark 3.2) and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(t)} = \mathbf{e}\tilde{\pi}. \quad (3.34)$$

Furthermore, the ergodicity of  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and (3.33) imply that the mean first passage time of  $\{(X_t, J_t)\}$  to each state in  $\{(0, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$  is finite for any given initial state, which leads to the result that the unique communicating class  $\mathbb{C}$  is positive recurrent. Therefore, it follows from [6, Theorems II.10.1 and II.10.2] and [1, Section 5.4, Theorem 4.5] that  $\mathbf{Q}$  has the unique stationary probability vector  $\pi$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}^{(t)} = \mathbf{e}\pi. \quad (3.35)$$

It also follows from Lemma 3.4 (b) that  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}\mathbf{T}_d \leq \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(t)}\mathbf{T}_d$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Applying the dominated convergence theorem to this inequality and using (3.34) and (3.35), we obtain  $\mathbf{e}\pi\mathbf{T}_d \leq \mathbf{e}\tilde{\pi}\mathbf{T}_d$  and thus  $\pi\mathbf{T}_d \leq \tilde{\pi}\mathbf{T}_d$ .  $\square$

## 4 Block-augmented truncation

In this section, we discuss the block-augmented truncation of infinite-order block-structured infinitesimal generators. For this purpose, we assume that Assumption 3.1 holds for  $N = \infty$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is an  $|\mathbb{F}| \times |\mathbb{F}|$  stable and conservative infinitesimal generator.

We begin with the definition of the block-augmented truncation of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

**Definition 4.1** Let  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_* = ({}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote an infinitesimal generator such that, for  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) &\geq q(k, i; l, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, 0 \leq l \leq n, \\ {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; k, j) &= q(k, i; k, j), & k = l \geq n+1, \\ {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) &= 0, & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, l \geq n+1, l \neq k, \\ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} q(k, i; l, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned}$$

The infinitesimal generator  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  is called a *block-augmented northwest-corner truncation* (for short, *block-augmented truncation*) of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

Clearly,  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  has the following form:

$${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_* = \left( \begin{array}{c|ccccc} {}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*^{\leq n} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ \hline * & * & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ * & \mathbf{O} & * & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ * & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & * & \mathbf{O} & \cdots \\ * & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & * & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

where  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*^{\leq n}$  denotes the  $|\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}| \times |\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}|$  northwest-corner of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$ . It may seem more reasonable to define  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*^{\leq n}$  as a block-augmented truncation of  $\mathbf{Q}$ , instead of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$ . Nevertheless, we adopt  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  in order to perform algebraic operations on the original infinitesimal generator and its block-augmented truncation.

For further discussion, we assume that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is irreducible, under which we present some fundamental results on the block-augmented truncation.

**Lemma 4.1** *If  $\mathbf{Q}$  is irreducible, then  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  has no closed communicating classes in  $\mathbb{F}^{>n} := \mathbb{F} \setminus \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ .*

*Proof.* We assume that there exists a closed communicating class  $\mathbb{C}$  in  $\mathbb{F}^{>n}$ . Since  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  is block-diagonal in  $\mathbb{F}^{>n}$ , the closed communicating class  $\mathbb{C}$  must be within a set  $\{(k, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$  for some  $k \geq n + 1$ , which implies that the  $|\mathbb{C}| \times |\mathbb{C}|$  submatrix of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  is a conservative infinitesimal generator. From this result and Definition 4.1 of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$ , we have

$$\sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{C}} q(k, i; l, j) = \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{C}} {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) = 0, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (4.2)$$

Note here that the *whole* matrices  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  are also conservative infinitesimal generators, i.e.,

$$q(k, i; l, j) \geq 0, \quad {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) \geq 0, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{(k, i)\}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}} q(k, i; l, j) = \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}} {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) = 0, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}. \quad (4.4)$$

It follows from (4.2)–(4.4) that

$$q(k, i; l, j) = {}_{(n)}q_*(k, i; l, j) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (k, i) \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } (l, j) \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \mathbb{C}.$$

Therefore, the original Markov chain  $\{(X(t), J(t))\}$  with infinitesimal generator  $\mathbf{Q}$  cannot move out of  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{F}^{>n}$ . This contradicts to the irreducibility of  $\{(X(t), J(t))\}$ . As a result,  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  has no closed communicating classes in  $\mathbb{F}^{>n}$ .  $\square$

Lemma 4.1 shows that any closed communicating class of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  is finite (because it is in finite set  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ ) and thus is positive recurrent due to [1, Section 5.1, Proposition 1.4] and [13, Theorem 4.8]. Therefore, it follows from [1, Section 5.4, Theorem 4.5] that  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  has at least one stationary probability vector.

We now have the following result.

**Lemma 4.2** Suppose that  $Q$  is irreducible. Let  ${}_{(n)}\pi_* := ({}_{(n)}\pi_*(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote an arbitrary stationary probability vector of  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$ . It then holds that

$${}_{(n)}\pi_*(k, i) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}. \quad (4.5)$$

*Proof.* By definition,

$${}_{(n)}\pi_* {}_{(n)}Q_* = \mathbf{0}.$$

Thus, from (4.1) and Definition 4.1, we have

$${}_{(n)}\pi_*(k) {}_{(n)}Q_*(k; k) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for all } k \geq n + 1, \quad (4.6)$$

where  ${}_{(n)}\pi_*(k) = ({}_{(n)}\pi_*(k, i))_{i \in \mathbb{D}}$  and  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k; k) = (q(k, i; k, j))_{i, j \in \mathbb{D}}$ . Note here that  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k; k)$ ,  $k \geq n + 1$ , is the infinitesimal generator of a Markov chain restricted to the set of states  $\{(k, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\} \subset \mathbb{F}^{>n}$ . Note also that all the states in  $\mathbb{F}^{>n}$  are transient, as shown in Lemma 4.1. Therefore, for all  $k \geq n + 1$ ,  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k; k)$  is non-singular [5, Section 8.6.2]. Post-multiplying both sides of (4.6) by  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k; k)^{-1}$ , we obtain  ${}_{(n)}\pi_*(k) = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $n \geq k + 1$ , i.e., (4.5) holds.  $\square$

It follows from Assumption 3.1 and Definition 4.1 that  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  is stable and conservative. The irreducibility of  $Q$  makes  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  regular.

**Lemma 4.3** If  $Q$  is irreducible, then  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  is regular.

*Proof.* We assume that  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  is not regular, i.e., the equation

$${}_{(n)}Q_* \mathbf{x} = \gamma \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{e} \quad (4.7)$$

has a nontrivial solution for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Let  $\check{\mathbf{x}} := (\check{x}(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} \neq \mathbf{0}$  denote such a solution.

We now suppose that  $\check{x}(k, i) = 0$  for all  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ . It then follows from (4.7) and (4.1) that

$$[{}_{(n)}Q_*(k, k) - \gamma \mathbf{I}] \check{\mathbf{x}}(k) = \mathbf{0}, \quad k \geq n + 1,$$

where  $\check{\mathbf{x}}(k) = (\check{x}(k, i))_{i \in \mathbb{D}}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Since  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k, k)$  is a  $Q$ -matrix,  ${}_{(n)}Q_*(k, k) - \gamma \mathbf{I}$  is nonsingular and thus  $\check{\mathbf{x}}(k) = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $k \geq n + 1$ , which is inconsistent with  $\check{\mathbf{x}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

We have shown that  $\check{x}(k', i') > 0$  for some  $(k', i') \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ . In addition, since  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$  is a closed set of the states of  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$ , there exists a closed communicating class including the state  $(k', i') \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ , which implies that there exists a stationary probability vector  ${}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_* := ({}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_*(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  of  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  such that  ${}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_*(k', i') > 0$  [1, Section 5.4, Theorem 4.5]. Therefore,  ${}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_* \check{\mathbf{x}} > 0$ . On the other hand, pre-multiplying both sides of (4.7) by  ${}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_*$ , we have  $0 = \gamma \cdot {}_{(n)}\check{\pi}_* \check{\mathbf{x}} > 0$ , which is a contradiction. As a result, the assumption at the beginning is denied, i.e.,  ${}_{(n)}Q_*$  is regular.  $\square$

We consider two special cases of the block-augmented truncation. Let  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n = ({}_{(n)}q_n(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote an infinitesimal generator such that, for  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$${}_{(n)}q_n(k, i; l, j) = \begin{cases} q(k, i; l, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, 0 \leq l \leq n-1, \\ q(k, i; n, j) + \sum_{m>n, m \neq k} q(k, i; m, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, l = n, \\ q(k, i; k, j), & k = l \geq n+1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Let  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_0 = ({}_{(n)}q_0(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote an infinitesimal generator such that, for  $i, j \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$${}_{(n)}q_0(k, i; l, j) = \begin{cases} q(k, i; 0, j) + \sum_{m>n, m \neq k}^{\infty} q(k, i; m, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, l = 0, \\ q(k, i; l, j), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, 1 \leq l \leq n, \\ q(k, i; k, j), & k = l \geq n+1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

We call  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$  the *last-column-block-augmented northwest-corner truncation* (for short, *LC-block-augmented truncation*) of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We also call  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_0$  the *first-column-block-augmented northwest-corner truncation* (for short, *FC-block-augmented truncation*) of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

Let  ${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n := ({}_{(n)}\pi_n(k, i))_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  and  ${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 := ({}_{(n)}\pi_0(k, i))_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote the stationary probability vectors of  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$  and  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_0$ , respectively. It then follows from (4.5) that

$${}_{(n)}\pi_n(k, i) = {}_{(n)}\pi_0(k, i) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}.$$

The following theorem is the continuous-time version of [15, Theorem 3.6].

**Theorem 4.1** *Let  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  be an arbitrary block-augmented truncation of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . If  $\mathbf{Q}$  is ergodic (i.e., irreducible and positive recurrent) and  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ , then the following are true.*

- (a)  ${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_*$  and  ${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n$  have the unique stationary probability vectors  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*$  and  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$ , respectively and

$${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_* \prec_d {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n \prec_d \boldsymbol{\pi}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.10)$$

- (b) As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\{{}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n\}$  and  $\{{}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_0\}$  converge to  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  elementwise, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 = \boldsymbol{\pi}. \quad (4.11)$$

- (c) If either  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_0 \in \text{BM}_d$  or  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_* \in \text{BM}_d$ , then

$${}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 \prec_d {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_* \prec_d {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_n \prec_d \boldsymbol{\pi}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.12)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} {}_{(n)}\boldsymbol{\pi}_* = \boldsymbol{\pi}. \quad (4.13)$$

*Proof.* Definition 4.1 and (4.8) imply that

$$({}_n)Q_* \prec_d ({}_n)Q_n \prec_d Q, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore,  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$  implies  $({}_n)Q_n \in \text{BM}_d$ . It follows from these results and Lemma 3.5 (b) that statement (a) holds.

Next, we prove statement (b). From (4.9), we have

$$({}_n)Q_0 \prec_d ({}_{n+1})Q_0 \prec_d Q, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Combining this and Lemma 3.5 (b) yields

$$({}_n)\pi_0 \prec_d ({}_{n+1})\pi_0 \prec_d \pi, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.14)$$

In addition, (4.10) implies that

$$({}_n)\pi_0 \prec_d ({}_n)\pi_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.15)$$

It follows from (4.14) and (4.15) that, for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there exists some  $k_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that

$$\sum_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>k_\varepsilon}} ({}_n)\pi_0(k, i) \leq \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>k_\varepsilon}} ({}_n)\pi_n(k, i) < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.16)$$

Therefore,  $({}_n)\Pi_0 := \{({}_n)\pi_0; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $({}_n)\Pi_n := \{({}_n)\pi_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are *tight* [3, Theorem 5.1].

Using the tightness of  $({}_n)\Pi_0$ , we provide the proof of  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ({}_n)\pi_0 = \pi$  only, because we can readily prove  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ({}_n)\pi_n = \pi$  in the same way. Let  $\{({}_{n_m})\pi_0; m \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  denote an arbitrary convergent subsequence of  $({}_n)\Pi_0$  such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} ({}_{n_m})\pi_0 = \pi_0, \quad (4.17)$$

where  $\pi_0 := (\pi_0(k, i) \in \mathbb{F})$  is a probability vector. Let  $({}_n)P_0^{(t)} := (({}_n)p_0^{(t)}(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote the transition matrix function of the infinitesimal generator  $({}_n)Q_0$ . It then follows from that

$$({}_{n_m})\pi_0 ({}_{n_m})P_0^{(t)} = ({}_{n_m})\pi_0. \quad (4.18)$$

It also follows [9, Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.2] from that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ({}_n)P_0^{(t)} = P^{(t)}. \quad (4.19)$$

Applying Fatou's lemma, (4.17) and (4.19) to (4.18), we have

$$\pi_0 P^{(t)} \leq \pi_0, \quad (4.20)$$

which shows that  $\pi_0$  is the subinvariant probability vector of  $P^{(t)}$ . Recall here that  $Q$  is ergodic. Thus, the ergodicity of  $Q$  and (4.20) imply that  $\pi_0 P^{(t)} = \pi_0$  [1, Section 5.2, Theorem 2.8], i.e.,  $\pi_0$  is a stationary probability vector of  $Q$  (see Definition 3.1 and Remark 3.2). Furthermore,

since the ergodic infinitesimal generator  $\mathbf{Q}$  has the unique stationary probability vector, we have  $\pi_0 = \pi$ . This result and [3, Corollary of Theorem 5.1] yield

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} {}_{(n)}\pi_0 = \pi,$$

which leads to (4.11).

Finally, we prove statement (c). From Definition 4.1 and (4.9), we have

$${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_0 \prec_d {}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_*, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, Lemma 3.5 (b) yields  ${}_{(n)}\pi_0 \prec_d {}_{(n)}\pi_*$ . Combining this and (4.10), we have (4.12). From (4.12) and (4.16), we also have

$$\sum_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>k_\varepsilon}} {}_{(n)}\pi_0(k,i) \leq \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>k_\varepsilon}} {}_{(n)}\pi_*(k,i) < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which shows that  ${}_{(n)}\Pi_* := \{{}_{(n)}\pi_*; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is tight. As a result, proceeding as in the proof of statement (b), we can prove (4.13).  $\square$

Theorem 4.1 shows that  $\{{}_{(n)}\pi_*\}$ ,  $\{{}_{(n)}\pi_n\}$  and  $\{{}_{(n)}\pi_0\}$  can be approximations to  $\pi$ . It also follows from (4.10) that, all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,

$$0 \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \{\pi(k,i) - {}_{(n)}\pi_n(k,i)\} \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \{\pi(k,i) - {}_{(n)}\pi_*(k,i)\}. \quad (4.21)$$

Therefore, we can say that the LC-block-augmented truncation of  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  is the best among all the block-augmented truncations of  $\mathbf{Q}$  in the sense shown in (4.21). Furthermore, if  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_* \in \text{BM}_d$ , then

$$0 \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \{\pi(k,i) - {}_{(n)}\pi_*(k,i)\} \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \{\pi(k,i) - {}_{(n)}\pi_0(k,i)\},$$

which shows that the FC-block-augmented truncation of  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  is the worst among all the *block-monotone* block-augmented truncations of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

## 5 Error bounds for last-column-block-augmented truncation

In the previous section, we already have shown that the stationary probability vector  $\{{}_{(n)}\pi_n\}$  of the LC-block-augmented truncation  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$  is the best approximation to the stationary probability vector  $\pi$  of  $\mathbf{Q}$ , where  $\mathbf{Q}$  is assumed to be block monotone and is of order  $|\mathbb{F}| \times |\mathbb{F}|$ . In this section, we do not necessarily assume  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ , but we assume that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is block-wise dominated by another generator  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$ , which is possibly equal to  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We then present error bounds for the total variation distance between  ${}_{(n)}\pi$  and  $\pi$ , i.e.,

$$\|{}_{(n)}\pi - \pi\| := \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}} |{}_{(n)}\pi(k,i) - \pi(k,i)|,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the total variation norm.

We now introduce some definitions and assumptions for the subsequent discussion. For any  $1 \times |\mathbb{F}|$  vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}}$ , let  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_v$  denote

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_v := \sup_{|\mathbf{g}| \leq \mathbf{v}} \left| \sum_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} x(k, i) g(k, i) \right| = \sup_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{g} \leq \mathbf{v}} \sum_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} |x(k, i)| g(k, i),$$

where  $|\mathbf{g}|$  is a column vector obtained by taking the absolute value of each element of  $\mathbf{g}$ . The quantity  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_v$  is called the  $v$ -norm of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Note here that  $\|\cdot\|_e = \|\cdot\|$ , i.e., the  $e$ -norm is equivalent to the total variation norm. Let  $\mathbb{I}_{\{\cdot\}}$  denote a function that takes value one if the statement in the braces is true and takes value zero otherwise. For  $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , let  $\mathbf{1}_K = (1_K(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote a column vector such that

$$1_K(k, i) = \begin{cases} 1, & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq K}, \\ 0, & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{> K}. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, let  $\{(n)X_t, (n)J_t; t \geq 0\}$  denote a Markov chain with infinitesimal generator  $(n)\mathbf{Q}_n$ , and let  $(n)\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(k, i) = ((n)p_n^{(t)}(k, i; l, j))_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote a probability vector such that

$$(n)p_n^{(t)}(k, i; l, j) = \mathbb{P}((n)X_t = l, (n)J_t = j \mid (n)X_0 = k, (n)J_0 = i).$$

It follows from (4.8) that

$$(n)p_n^{(t)}(k, i; l, j) = 0, \quad t \geq 0, (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}, (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{> n}. \quad (5.1)$$

For any function  $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{F}$ , let  $\varphi(k, \varpi) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) \varphi(k, i)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , where  $\varpi = (\varpi(i))_{i \in \mathbb{D}}$  is a  $1 \times d$  probability vector such that  $\varpi(i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi(k, i)$  for  $i \in \mathbb{D}$ . Finally, we make the following assumptions:

**Assumption 5.1** (i)  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ ; (ii)  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  is irreducible.

**Assumption 5.2** There exist some  $c, b \in (0, \infty)$ , and column vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} \in \text{Bl}_d$  with  $\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{e}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{v} \leq -c\mathbf{v} + b\mathbf{1}_0. \quad (5.2)$$

Under Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2,  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  is exponentially ergodic [20, Theorem 20.3.2]. Thus, Lemma 3.5 implies that  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  have the unique stationary probability vectors  $\tilde{\pi}$  and  $\pi$ , respectively, such that  $\pi \prec_d \tilde{\pi}$ .

In what follows, we estimate  $\|(n)\pi_n - \pi\|$ . Lemma 3.3 implies that  $\varpi$  is the common stationary probability vector of the Markov chains  $\{J_t\}$  and  $\{\tilde{J}_t\}$  and thus

$$\varpi(i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi(k, i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}(k, i), \quad i \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore, it follows from the triangular inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(n)\pi_n - \pi\| &\leq \|\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - \pi\| + \|(n)\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - (n)\pi_n\| \\ &\quad + \|(n)\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - \mathbf{p}^{(t)}(0, \varpi)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

The following lemma provides upper bounds for the first and second terms in the right hand side of (5.4).

**Lemma 5.1** *If Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 hold, then, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(k, \varpi) - \boldsymbol{\pi}\|_v \leq 2e^{-ct} [v(k, \varpi)(1 - 1_0(k, \varpi)) + b/c], \quad (5.5)$$

$$\|({}_n\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(k, \varpi) - {}_n\boldsymbol{\pi}_n)\|_v \leq 2e^{-ct} [v(k, \varpi)(1 - 1_0(k, \varpi)) + b/c] \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* We first prove (5.5). Let  $(X, J)$  and  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{J})$  denote two random vectors on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X = k, J = i) &= \pi(k, i), & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X} = k, \tilde{J} = i) &= \tilde{\pi}(k, i), & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (5.3) and  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \prec_d \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(J = i) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \pi(l, i) = \varpi(i) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}(l, i) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{J} = i), & i \in \mathbb{D}, \\ \mathbb{P}(X > k \mid J = i) &= \frac{\sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \pi(l, i)}{\varpi(i)} \leq \frac{\sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}(l, i)}{\varpi(i)} = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X} > k \mid \tilde{J} = i), & k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can assume that  $X \leq \tilde{X}$  and  $J = \tilde{J}$  [21, Theorem 1.2.4].

We now define  $\{(\tilde{X}_t^{(h)}, \tilde{J}_t^{(h)}); t \geq 0\}$ ,  $h = 0, 1, 2$ , as Markov chains with infinitesimal generator  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  such that

$$(\tilde{X}_0^{(0)}, \tilde{J}_0^{(0)}) = (0, \tilde{J}), \quad (\tilde{X}_0^{(1)}, \tilde{J}_0^{(1)}) = (k, \tilde{J}), \quad (\tilde{X}_0^{(2)}, \tilde{J}_0^{(2)}) = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{J}).$$

We also define  $\{(X_t^{(h)}, J_t^{(h)}); t \geq 0\}$ ,  $h = 0, 1, 2$ , as Markov chains with infinitesimal generator  $\mathbf{Q}$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  such that

$$(X_0^{(0)}, J_0^{(0)}) = (0, J), \quad (X_0^{(1)}, J_0^{(1)}) = (k, J), \quad (X_0^{(2)}, J_0^{(2)}) = (X, J).$$

Recall here that  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$ . Therefore, according to Lemmas A.1 and A.2, we assume, without loss of generality, that, for each  $h = 0, 1, 2$ ,

$$X_t^{(h)} \leq \tilde{X}_t^{(h)}, \quad J_t^{(h)} = \tilde{J}_t^{(h)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (5.7)$$

and that

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(0)} \leq \tilde{X}_t^{(1)}, \quad \tilde{X}_t^{(0)} \leq \tilde{X}_t^{(2)}, \quad \tilde{J}_t^{(0)} = \tilde{J}_t^{(1)} = \tilde{J}_t^{(2)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Let  $T^{(h)} = \inf\{u \geq 0; X_t^{(h)} = X_t^{(0)} \text{ for all } t \geq u\}$  for  $h = 1, 2$ . Furthermore, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(k,i)}[\cdot] &= \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid X_0 = k, J_0 = i], & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{(k,i);(0,j)}[\cdot] &= \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid (X_0^{(h)}, J_0^{(h)}) = (k, i), (X_0^{(0)}, J_0^{(0)}) = (0, j)], & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, j \in \mathbb{D}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h = 1, 2$ . Proceeding as in the derivation of [18, Eq. (3.18)], we have, for  $|g| \leq v$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |p^{(t)}(k, \varpi)g - \pi g| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(k,J);(0,J)} [v(X_t^{(1)}, J_t^{(1)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(1)} > t\}}] \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(k,J);(0,J)} [v(X_t^{(0)}, J_t^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(1)} > t\}}] \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(X,J);(0,J)} [v(X_t^{(2)}, J_t^{(2)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(2)} > t\}}] \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(X,J);(0,J)} [v(X_t^{(0)}, J_t^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(2)} > t\}}] \right]. \tag{5.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.9) with (5.7), (5.8) and  $v \in \text{Bl}_d$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|p^{(t)}(k, \varpi)g - \pi g| & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(k,J);(0,J)} [v(\tilde{X}_t^{(1)}, \tilde{J}_t^{(1)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(1)} > t\}}] \right] \\
& \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(X,J);(0,J)} [v(\tilde{X}_t^{(2)}, \tilde{J}_t^{(2)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{T^{(2)} > t\}}] \right], \quad |g| \leq v. \tag{5.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (5.7) and (5.8) that, for each  $h \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{\tilde{X}_u^{(h)} = 0\}$  implies  $\{X_u^{(h)} = X_u^{(0)} = 0\}$  and thus  $\{X_t^{(h)} = X_t^{(0)} \text{ for all } t \geq u\}$ , which leads to  $T^{(h)} \leq \inf\{t \geq 0; \tilde{X}_t^{(h)} = 0\}$ . Therefore, (5.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p^{(t)}(k, \varpi) - \pi\|_v & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(k,\tilde{J})} [v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \right] \\
& \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{X},\tilde{J})} [v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \right], \tag{5.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\tau}_0 = \inf\{t \geq 0; \tilde{X}_t = 0\}$ .

Let  $M_t = e^{ct}v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}$  for  $t \geq 0$ . It is shown in Lemma B.1 that  $\{M_t\}$  is a supermartingale. Let  $\{\theta_\nu; \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  denote a sequence of stopping times for  $\{M_t; t \geq 0\}$  such that  $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq \dots$  and  $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \theta_\nu = \infty$ . It then follows that, for any  $u \geq 0$ ,  $\min(u, \theta_\nu)$  is a stopping time for  $\{M_t; t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ . Therefore, using Doob's optional sampling theorem (or Doob's optional stopping theorem) [25, Section 10.10], we have  $\mathbb{E}_{(k,i)}[M_{\min(t, \theta_\nu)}] \leq \mathbb{E}_{(k,i)}[M_0]$  for  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(k,i)}[e^{c\min(t, \theta_\nu)}v(\tilde{X}_{\min(t, \theta_\nu)}, \tilde{J}_{\min(t, \theta_\nu)})\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > \min(t, \theta_\nu)\}}] \leq v(k, i)(1 - 1_0(k, i)), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Letting  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality and using Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{(k,i)}[v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \leq e^{-ct}v(k, i)(1 - 1_0(k, i)), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}, \tag{5.12}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(k,\tilde{J})} [v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \right] & = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) \mathbb{E}_{(k,i)} [v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \\
& \leq e^{-ct}v(k, \varpi)(1 - 1_0(k, \varpi)), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{5.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use  $1_0(k, i) = 1_0(k, \varpi)$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{D}$ . Furthermore, pre-multiplying both sides of (5.2) by  $\tilde{\pi}$ , we have  $\tilde{\pi}v \leq b/c$ . Combining this and (5.12) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{J})} [v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}] \right] \leq e^{-ct} \sum_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} \pi(k, i) v(k, i) \leq e^{-ct} \frac{b}{c}. \quad (5.14)$$

Substituting (5.13) and (5.14) into (5.11), we obtain (5.5).

Next, we prove (5.6). Let  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n := ({}_{(n)}\tilde{q}_n(k, i; l, j))_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  denote the LC-block-augmented truncation of  $\tilde{Q}$  in a similar way to (4.8). Since  $Q \prec_d \tilde{Q}$  and  $\tilde{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ , we have  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n \in \text{BM}_d$  and

$${}_{(n)}Q_n \prec_d {}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n \prec_d \tilde{Q}.$$

It follows from  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n \prec_d \tilde{Q}$ ,  $v \in \text{Bl}_d$  and (5.2) that

$${}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n v \leq \tilde{Q} v \leq -cv + b\mathbb{1}_0. \quad (5.15)$$

Therefore, we can readily prove (5.6) by replacing  $\tilde{Q}$  and  $Q$  by  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{Q}_n$  and  ${}_{(n)}Q_n$  in the proof of (5.5). The details are omitted.  $\square$

According to Lemma 5.1, it remains to estimate the third term in the right hand side of (5.4) in order to derive an upper bound for  $\|{}_{(n)}\pi_n - \pi\|$ . By doing this, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1** *If Assumption 5.1 holds, then*

$$\|{}_{(n)}\pi_n - \pi\| \leq \frac{b}{c} \left( 4e^{-ct} + 2t \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{|\tilde{q}(n, j; n, j)|}{v(n, j)} \right) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t \geq 0. \quad (5.16)$$

*Proof.* Letting  $k = 0$  and  $v = e$  in (5.5) and (5.6) (see Lemma 5.1) and substituting the result into (5.4), we have

$$\|{}_{(n)}\pi_n - \pi\| \leq \frac{4be^{-ct}}{c} + \|{}_{(n)}p_n^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - p^{(t)}(0, \varpi)\|.$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove that

$$\|{}_{(n)}p_n^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - p^{(t)}(0, \varpi)\| \leq \frac{2tb}{c} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{|\tilde{q}(n, j; n, j)|}{v(n, j)} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t \geq 0. \quad (5.17)$$

Note here that all the off-diagonal elements of  $Q$  are nonnegative. Using this fact, (5.1) and Lemma B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|{}_{(n)}p_n^{(t)}(0, \varpi) - p^{(t)}(0, \varpi)\| \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) \|{}_{(n)}p_n^{(t)}(0, i) - p^{(t)}(0, i)\| \\ & \leq 2 \int_0^t \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(0, i; l, j) \right) du \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} |q(l, j; l', j')| \\ & = 2 \int_0^t \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(0, i; l, j) \right) du \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} q(l, j; l', j'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

In addition,  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  yields

$$\sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} q(l, j; l', j') \leq \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(l, j; l', j'), \quad (l, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}.$$

Substituting this inequality into (5.18) and using (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|({}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi}) - \mathbf{p}^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi})\| \\ & \leq 2 \int_0^t \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(u)}(0, i; l, j) \right) du \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(l, j; l', j') \\ & = 2 \int_0^t \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \varpi(i) {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(u)}(0, i; l, j) \right) du \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(l, j; l', j') \\ & = 2 \int_0^t (\boldsymbol{\varpi}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, )_{(n)}\mathbf{P}_n^{(u)} \mathbf{a}_n du, \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_n := (a_n(l, j))_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  is a column vector such that

$$a_n(l, j) = \begin{cases} \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(l, j; l', j'), & (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}, \\ \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(n, j; l', j'), & (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}. \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

It follows from (5.20) and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$  that  $\mathbf{a}_n \in \text{Bl}_d$ . It also follows from (5.20) and the definition of  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n$  that, for  $(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{q}_n(l, j; n, j') &= \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} \tilde{q}(l, j; n, j') + \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} \tilde{q}(l, j; l', j') \\ &= \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} \tilde{q}(l, j; n, j') + a_n(l, j), \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$a_n(l, j) = \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} ({}_{(n)}\tilde{q}(l, j; n, j') - \tilde{q}(l, j; n, j')), \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}. \quad (5.21)$$

We now define  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n := ({}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}}$  as the stationary probability vector of  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  is irreducible, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$${}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(k, i) = 0, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}. \quad (5.22)$$

It also follows from  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$  that  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n \in \text{BM}_d$  and  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n \prec_d {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ . Thus, Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 imply that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(k, i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}(k, i) = \varpi(i), \quad i \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (5.23)$$

$${}_{(n)}\mathbf{P}_n^{(t)} \prec_d {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} \in \text{BM}_d, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.24)$$

where  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{P}_n^{(t)}$  and  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)}$  are the transition matrix functions of the infinitesimal generators  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$  and  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n$ , respectively. Using (5.24) and  $\mathbf{a}_n \in \text{Bl}_d$ , we have

$${}_{(n)}\mathbf{P}_n^{(t)} \mathbf{a}_n \leq {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} \mathbf{a}_n, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Applying this inequality to (5.19) yields

$$\left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi}) - \mathbf{p}^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi}) \right\| \leq 2 \int_0^t (\boldsymbol{\varpi}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, ) {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(u)} \mathbf{a}_n \, du. \quad (5.25)$$

Note here that (5.23) leads to  $(\boldsymbol{\varpi}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, ) \prec_d {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n$ . Combining this and Proposition 2.1, we have, for  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$(\boldsymbol{\varpi}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, ) {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} \prec_d {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} = {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n, \quad (5.26)$$

where the last equality follows from  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} = {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n$ . Furthermore, using (5.26) and  $\mathbf{a}_n \in \text{Bl}_d$ , we obtain

$$(\boldsymbol{\varpi}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, ) {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{(t)} \mathbf{a}_n \leq {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{a}_n, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Substituting this into (5.25) results in

$$\left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi}) - \mathbf{p}^{(t)}(0, \boldsymbol{\varpi}) \right\| \leq 2t {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{a}_n. \quad (5.27)$$

In what follows, we estimate  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{a}_n$ . From (5.21), (5.22) and  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n {}_{(n)}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_n = \mathbf{0}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{a}_n &= \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(l, j) \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} ({}_{(n)}\tilde{q}_n(l, j; n, j') - \tilde{q}(l, j; n, j')) \\ &= \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(l, j) \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} (-\tilde{q}(l, j; n, j')) \\ &= \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(l, j) (-\tilde{q}(l, j; n, j')). \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

By definition,  $-\tilde{q}(l, j; n, j') \leq 0$  for  $(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n} \setminus \{(n, j')\}$  and  $-\tilde{q}(n, j'; n, j') \geq 0$ . Therefore,

$$\sum_{(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(l, j) (-\tilde{q}(l, j; n, j')) \leq {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(n, j') |\tilde{q}(n, j'; n, j')|. \quad j' \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Applying this to (5.28), we have

$${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{a}_n \leq \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} {}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(n, j') |\tilde{q}(n, j'; n, j')|, \quad (5.29)$$

Pre-multiplying both sides of (5.15) by  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n$ , we obtain  ${}_{(n)}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_n \mathbf{v} \leq b/c$ , which leads to

$${}_{(n)}\tilde{\pi}_n(n, j') \leq \frac{b}{c} \cdot \frac{1}{v(n, j')}, \quad j' \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (5.30)$$

Using (5.30) and (5.29), we have

$$({}_n)\tilde{\pi}_n \mathbf{a}_n \leq \frac{b}{c} \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{|\tilde{q}(n, j'; n, j')|}{v(n, j')}.$$

Substituting this inequality into (5.27) yields (5.17).  $\square$

From Theorem 5.1, we obtain Corollary 5.1 below, where the drift condition (5.2) for  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  is weakened whereas the set of states  $\{(0, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$  is assumed to be reachable directly from each of the states  $\{(K, i); i \in \mathbb{D}\}$  with a sufficiently large  $K$ .

**Corollary 5.1** *Suppose that Assumption 5.1 holds and there exist some  $c', b' \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and column vector  $\mathbf{v}' := (v'(k, i))_{(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}} \in \text{Bl}_d$  with  $\mathbf{v}' \geq \mathbf{e}$  such that*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{v}' \leq -c'\mathbf{v}' + b'\mathbf{1}_K. \quad (5.31)$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; l) = (\tilde{q}(k, i; l, j))_{(i, j) \in \mathbb{D}}$  for  $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and suppose that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(K; 0)\mathbf{e} > \mathbf{0}.$$

Under these conditions, (5.16) holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \geq 0$ , where

$$c = \frac{c'}{1 + B}; \quad (5.32)$$

$$b \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } be \geq b'\mathbf{e} - B\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(0; 0)\mathbf{e}; \quad (5.33)$$

$$v(k, i) = \begin{cases} v'(0, i), & k = 0, i \in \mathbb{D}, \\ v'(k, i) + B, & k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathbb{D}; \text{ and} \end{cases} \quad (5.34)$$

$$B \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } B \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(K; 0)\mathbf{e} \geq b'\mathbf{e}. \quad (5.35)$$

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that (5.2) holds. It follows from (5.34) and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; l)\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; l)\mathbf{v}(l) &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; l)(\mathbf{v}'(l) + B\mathbf{e}) + \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; 0)\mathbf{v}'(0) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; l)\mathbf{v}'(l) - B\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(k; 0)\mathbf{e}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

Substituting (5.31) and  $\mathbf{v}'(0) = \mathbf{v}(0)$  into (5.36) with  $k = 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(0; l)\mathbf{v}(l) &\leq -c'\mathbf{v}(0) + b'\mathbf{e} - B\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(0; 0)\mathbf{e} \\ &\leq -c'\mathbf{v}(0) + b\mathbf{e} \\ &\leq -c\mathbf{v}(0) + b\mathbf{e}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where the second and third inequalities follow from (5.33) and  $c' \geq c$  (due to (5.32)), respectively.

It follows from  $\tilde{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  that  $\tilde{Q}(k; 0)e \geq \tilde{Q}(K; 0)e$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . Applying this inequality and (5.31) to (5.36) with  $1 \leq k \leq K$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}(k; l)v(l) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}(k; l)v'(l) - B\tilde{Q}(K; 0)e \\ &\leq -c'v'(k) + b'e - B\tilde{Q}(K; 0)e \\ &\leq -c'v'(k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

where the last inequality holds due to (5.35). Note here that (5.32), (5.34) and  $v' \geq e$  imply

$$cv(k) = c(v'(k) + Be) \leq c'v'(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (5.39)$$

from which and (5.38) we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}(k; l)v(l) \leq -cv(k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K. \quad (5.40)$$

Finally, substituting (5.31) into (5.36) with  $k \geq K + 1$  and using (5.39) and  $\tilde{Q}(k; 0)e \geq 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}(k; l)v(l) &\leq -c'v'(k) - B\tilde{Q}(k; 0)e \\ &\leq -cv(k) - B\tilde{Q}(k; 0)e \\ &\leq -cv(k), \quad k = K + 1, K + 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (5.41)$$

As a result, combining (5.37), (5.40) and (5.41), we have (5.2).  $\square$

## 6 Applications

In this section, we demonstrate the applicability of the error bounds presented in Section 5. To this end, we consider a queue with a batch Markovian arrival process (BMAP) [17] and level-dependent departure rates.

We first describe the BMAP. The BAMP is controlled by an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain  $\{J(t); t \geq 0\}$  with a finite state space  $\mathbb{D} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ , which is called the background Markov chain. Let  $N(t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , denote the total number of arrivals in time interval  $(0, t]$ , where  $N(0) = 0$ . We assume that  $\{(N(t), J(t)); t \geq 0\}$  is a continuous-time Markov chain with state space  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{D}$  and conservative infinitesimal generator  $Q_{\text{BMAP}}$  given by

$$Q_{\text{BMAP}} = \begin{pmatrix} D(0) & D(1) & D(2) & D(3) & \cdots \\ O & D(0) & D(1) & D(2) & \cdots \\ O & O & D(0) & D(1) & \cdots \\ O & O & O & D(0) & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{D}(k) := (D_{i,j}(k))_{i,j \in \mathbb{D}}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , is an  $d \times d$  nonnegative matrix and  $\mathbf{D}(0) := (D_{i,j}(0))_{i,j \in \mathbb{D}}$  is a  $d \times d$   $Q$ -matrix. It then follows that, for  $t \geq 0$  and  $\Delta t \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(N(t + \Delta t) - N(t) = k, J(t + \Delta t) = j \mid J(t) = i) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 + D_{i,i}(0)\Delta t + o(\Delta t), & k = 0, i = j \in \mathbb{D}, \\ D_{i,j}(0)\Delta t + o(\Delta t), & k = 0, i \neq j, i, j \in \mathbb{D}, \\ D_{i,j}(k)\Delta t + o(\Delta t), & k \in \mathbb{N}, i, j \in \mathbb{D}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

where  $f(x) = o(g(x))$  represents  $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} |f(x)|/|g(x)| = 0$ . According to (6.1), the BMAP is characterized by  $\{\mathbf{D}(k); k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  and thus is denoted by BMAP  $\{\mathbf{D}(k); k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ .

It should be noted that the infinitesimal generator of the background Markov chain  $\{J(t); t \geq 0\}$  is given by  $\mathbf{D} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}(k)$ , which is irreducible and conservative. We define  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  as the stationary probability vector of  $\mathbf{D}$  and define  $\lambda$  as the arrival rate of BMAP  $\{\mathbf{D}(k); k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ , i.e.,

$$\lambda = \boldsymbol{\eta} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mathbf{D}(k) \mathbf{e}, \quad (6.2)$$

which is assumed to be positive.

Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^k \mathbf{D}(k)$  and

$$r_D = \sup \left\{ z \geq 0; \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^k \mathbf{D}(k) \text{ is finite} \right\}.$$

We then assume the following.

**Assumption 6.1**  $r_D > 1$ .

**Remark 6.1** Assumption 6.1 holds if  $\{\mathbf{D}(k); k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is light-tailed, i.e.,  $\mathbf{D}(k) \leq r^{-k} \mathbf{C}$  for some  $r > 1$  and  $d \times d$  finite nonnegative matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ .

For further discussion, we define  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z)$ ,  $0 \leq z < r_D$ , as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z) = \mathbf{I} + \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z)}{\max_{j \in \mathbb{D}} |D_{j,j}(0)|} \geq \mathbf{O}. \quad (6.3)$$

It follows from [11, Theorem 8.3.1] that there exists nonnegative vectors  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(z) = (u(z, j))_{j \in \mathbb{D}}$  and  $\mathbf{u}(z) = (u(z, j))_{j \in \mathbb{D}}$  such that, for  $0 \leq z < r_D$ ,

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(z) \widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z) = \delta_E(z) \boldsymbol{\eta}(z), \quad \widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z) \mathbf{u}(z) = \delta_E(z) \mathbf{u}(z), \quad (6.4)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(z) \mathbf{u}(z) = 1, \quad \mathbf{u}(z) \geq \mathbf{e}, \quad (6.5)$$

where  $\delta_E(z)$  denotes the spectral radius of  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z)$ . Since  $\mathbf{D} = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(1)$  is an irreducible infinitesimal generator, the nonnegative matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z)$  is also irreducible for all  $0 < z < r_D$ , which implies that, for  $0 < z < r_D$ ,  $\delta_E(z)$  is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}(z)$  [11, Theorem 8.4.4].

We now define  $\delta_D(z)$ ,  $0 \leq z < r_D$ , as

$$\delta_D(z) = (\delta_E(z) - 1) \max_{j \in \mathbb{D}} |D_{j,j}(0)|,$$

where  $\delta_D(z)$  is increasing and convex because so is  $\delta_E(z)$  [12]. It follows from (6.3) and (6.4) that

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(z) \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z) = \delta_D(z) \boldsymbol{\eta}(z), \quad \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z) \mathbf{u}(z) = \delta_D(z) \mathbf{u}(z). \quad (6.6)$$

From (6.6) and (6.5), we have

$$\delta_D(z) = \boldsymbol{\eta}(z) \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z) \mathbf{u}(z). \quad (6.7)$$

It should be noted that  $\delta_D(z)$ ,  $0 < z < r_D$ , is a simple eigenvalue of  $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z)$ . In addition, Assumption 6.1 shows that  $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}(z)$  is *analytic* in a neighborhood of the point  $z = 1$ . Therefore,  $\delta_D(z)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{u}(z)$  are analytic at  $z = 1$  [2, Theorem 2.1]. Differentiating (6.7) at  $z = 1$  and using  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(1) = \boldsymbol{\eta}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}$ , we obtain

$$\delta'_D(1) = \boldsymbol{\eta} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}'(1) \mathbf{e} = \lambda, \quad (6.8)$$

where the last equality holds due to (6.2). Note also that  $\delta_D(1) = 0$  because  $\mathbf{D}$  is an irreducible and conservative infinitesimal generator.

Next, we explain the queue considered in the section. There exists a system with an infinite buffer and a possibly infinite number of servers (the number of servers is not specified for flexibility). Customers arrive at the system according to BMAP  $\{\mathbf{D}(k); k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ . When there are  $k$  customers in the system at time  $t$ , one of them leaves the system independently of the other customers in time interval  $(t, t + \Delta t]$  with probability  $\mu(k)\Delta t + o(\Delta t)$ , where  $\mu(0) = 0$  and  $\mu(k) \geq 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note here that the departure of a customer is caused by the completion of its service or the impatience with waiting for the service. In addition, the system can suffer from disasters, which can be regarded as *negative customers* that remove all the customers in the system including themselves on their arrivals. Disasters arrive at the system according to a Poisson process with rate  $\psi \geq 0$ , which is independent of the arrival and departure processes of (ordinary) customers. We now define  $L(t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$  as the queue length, i.e., the number of customers in the systems at time  $t$ . It then follows that the joint process  $\{(L(t), J(t)); t \geq 0\}$  of the queue length and the background state is a continuous-time Markov chain with state space  $\mathbb{F}$  and infinitesimal generator  $\mathbf{Q} = (q(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  given by

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}(0) & \mathbf{D}(1) & \mathbf{D}(2) & \mathbf{D}(3) & \cdots \\ (\psi + \mu(1))\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{D}(0) - \tilde{\mu}(1)\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{D}(1) & \mathbf{D}(2) & \cdots \\ \psi\mathbf{I} & \mu(2)\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{D}(0) - \tilde{\mu}(2)\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{D}(1) & \cdots \\ \psi\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{O} & \mu(3)\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{D}(0) - \tilde{\mu}(3)\mathbf{I} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.9)$$

where  $\tilde{\mu}(k) = \psi + \mu(k)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ .

**Remark 6.2** Suppose that  $\psi = 0$  and  $\tilde{\mu}(k) = \mu(k) = \mu + (k - 1)\mu'$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mu, \mu' > 0$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is the infinitesimal generator of the joint process of a BMAP/M/1 queue with impatient customers and no disasters, where service times follow an exponential distribution with rate  $\mu$  and “patient times” in queue are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) exponentially with rate  $\mu'$ . In addition, if  $\mu = \mu'$ , then  $\mathbf{Q}$  is the infinitesimal generator of the joint process of a BMAP/M/ $\infty$  queue with service rate  $\mu$ .

In what follows, we consider two cases: (a) no disasters occur; and (b) disasters can occur.

## 6.1 Case where no disasters occur

We make the following assumption.

**Assumption 6.2** (i)  $\mathbf{Q}$  is irreducible; (ii)  $\psi = 0$ ; and (iii)  $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(k) > \lambda$ .

Let  $G(z)$ ,  $0 \leq z < r_D$ , denote

$$G(z) = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(k) \cdot (1 - z^{-1}) - \delta_D(z), \quad 0 \leq z < r_D.$$

Recall here that  $\delta_D(1) = 0$ ,  $\delta'_D(1) = \lambda$  (see (6.8)) and  $\delta_D(z)$  is increasing and convex for  $0 \leq z < r_D$ . It follows from these facts and Assumption 6.2 that  $G(z)$ ,  $0 \leq z < r_D$  is continuous and

$$G(1) = 0, \quad G'(1) = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(k) - \lambda > 0,$$

which show that there exists some  $\beta > 1$  such that

$$c := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(k)(1 - \beta^{-1}) - \delta_D(\beta) > 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Let  $\mathbf{Q}(k; l) = (q(k, i; l, j))_{i, j \in \mathbb{D}}$  for  $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Let  $\mathbf{v}(k) = \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . From (6.6) and (6.9) with  $\psi = 0$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(0; l) \mathbf{v}(l) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}(l) \mathbf{v}(l) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\beta) \mathbf{u}(\beta) = \delta_D(\beta) \mathbf{u}(\beta) \\ &= -c \mathbf{v}(0) + (c + \delta_D(\beta)) \mathbf{u}(\beta) \\ &\leq -c \mathbf{v}(0) + b \mathbf{e}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

where

$$b = (c + \delta_D(\beta)) \max_{j \in \mathbb{D}} u(\beta, j). \quad (6.12)$$

From (6.6), (6.10) and (6.9) with  $\psi = 0$ , we also have, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(k; l) \mathbf{v}(l) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{D}(l) \mathbf{v}(l+k) + \mu(k) \mathbf{v}(k-1) - \mu(k) \mathbf{v}(k) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\beta) \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1}) \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta) \\ &= [\delta_D(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1})] \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta) \\ &\leq -c \mathbf{v}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

The inequalities (6.11) and (6.13) imply that Assumption 5.2 holds for  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} := \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $c \in (0, \infty)$  and  $b \in (0, \infty)$  given by (6.9), (6.10) and (6.12), respectively. As a result, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that

$$\|_{(n)} \pi_n - \pi\| \leq \frac{b}{c} \left( 4e^{-ct} + 2t \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{\mu(n) + |D_{j,j}(0)|}{u(\beta, j)} \beta^{-n} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

## 6.2 Case where disasters can occur

Instead of Assumption 6.2, we assume the following.

**Assumption 6.3** (i)  $\mathbf{Q}$  is irreducible; (ii)  $\psi > 0$ ; and there exists some  $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that

$$c' := \inf_{k \geq K+1} \{ \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1}) + \psi (1 - \beta^{-k}) - \delta_D(\beta) \} > 0. \quad (6.14)$$

**Remark 6.3** If  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(k) = \infty$ , then (6.14) holds.

Let  $\mathbf{v}'(k) = \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and

$$b' = \max_{0 \leq k \leq K} \{ [c' + \delta_D(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1}) - \psi (1 - \beta^{-k})] \beta^k \} \max_{j \in \mathbb{D}} u(\beta, j). \quad (6.15)$$

Proceeding as in the derivation of (6.11) and (6.13), we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(0; l) \mathbf{v}'(l) = -c' \mathbf{v}'(0) + (c' + \delta_D(\beta)) \mathbf{u}(\beta), \quad (6.16)$$

and, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(k; l) \mathbf{v}'(l) &= [\delta_D(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1})] \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta) + \psi \mathbf{v}'(0) - \psi \mathbf{v}'(k) \\ &= [\delta_D(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1}) - \psi (1 - \beta^{-k})] \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta) \\ &= -c' \mathbf{v}'(k) + [c' + \delta_D(\beta) - \mu(k) (1 - \beta^{-1}) - \psi (1 - \beta^{-k})] \beta^k \mathbf{u}(\beta). \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Applying (6.14) and (6.15) to (6.16) and (6.17) yields

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(k; l) \mathbf{v}'(l) \leq -c' \mathbf{v}'(k) + b' \mathbf{e}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, K, \quad (6.18)$$

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}(k; l) \mathbf{v}'(l) \leq -c' \mathbf{v}'(k), \quad k = K + 1, K + 2, \dots \quad (6.19)$$

It follows from (6.18) and (6.19) that (5.31) in Corollary 5.1 holds for  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} := \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $c' \in (0, \infty)$  and  $b' \in (0, \infty)$  given by (6.9), (6.14) and (6.15), respectively, where  $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  is fixed such that (6.14) holds. Note here that  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(K, 0) = \mathbf{Q}(K, 0)\mathbf{e} = \psi\mathbf{e} > \mathbf{0}$ . Thus, according to (5.35), fix  $B = b'\psi^{-1}$ . Furthermore, according to (5.32)–(5.34), fix

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{c'}{1 + b'\psi^{-1}}, \\ b &= b' \left( 1 - \psi^{-1} \min_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} D_{i,j}(0) \right), \\ v(k, i) &= \begin{cases} v'(0, i), & k = 0, i \in \mathbb{D}, \\ v'(k, i) + b'\psi^{-1}, & k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathbb{D}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}(n, j; n, j) &= q(n, j; n, j) = -\tilde{\mu}(n) + D_{j,j}(0) \\ &= -\psi - \mu(n) + D_{j,j}(0). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from Corollary 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(n)\boldsymbol{\pi}_n - \boldsymbol{\pi}\| &\leq \frac{b'}{c'} (1 + b'\psi^{-1}) \left( 1 - \psi^{-1} \min_{i \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} D_{i,j}(0) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( 4e^{-c't/(1+b'\psi^{-1})} + 2t \sum_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{\psi + \mu(n) + |D_{j,j}(0)|}{u(\beta, j) + b'\psi^{-1}\beta^{-n}} \beta^{-n} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

## A Pathwise ordering

This appendix presents two lemmas on the pathwise ordering associated with BMMCs. For this purpose, we consider two Markov chains  $\{(X_t, J_t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t); t \geq 0\}$  with the common state space  $\mathbb{F}^{\leq N}$  and the respectively infinitesimal generators  $\mathbf{Q} = (q(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{q}(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq N}}$ . It should be noted that  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  are not necessarily assumed to be ergodic here.

**Lemma A.1 (Pathwise ordering of a BMCM)** *If  $Q$  is regular and  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$ , then there exist two regular-jump Markov chains  $\{(X'_t, J'_t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(X''_t, J''_t); t \geq 0\}$  with infinitesimal generator  $Q$  on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  such that*

$$X'_t(\omega) \leq X''_t(\omega), \quad J'_t(\omega) = J''_t(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_0(\omega) \leq X''_0(\omega)$  and  $J'_0(\omega) = J''_0(\omega)$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $\delta > 0$  arbitrarily. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that  $\mathbf{P}^{(\delta)} \in \text{BM}$ . Therefore, according to [18, Lemma A.1], we can construct two discrete-time Markov chains  $\{(Y'_{\delta,\nu}, H'_{\delta,\nu}); \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  and  $\{(Y''_{\delta,\nu}, H''_{\delta,\nu}); \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  with transition probability matrix  $\mathbf{P}^{(\delta)}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  such that, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $Y'_{\delta,0}(\omega) \leq Y''_{\delta,0}(\omega)$  and  $H'_{\delta,0}(\omega) = H''_{\delta,0}(\omega)$ ,

$$Y'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) \leq Y''_{\delta,\nu}(\omega), \quad H'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) = H''_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using the two Markov chains, we define two stochastic processes  $\{(X'_{\delta,t}, J'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(X''_{\delta,t}, J''_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X'_{\delta,t} &= Y'_{\delta,\nu}, & J'_{\delta,t} &= H'_{\delta,\nu}, & \nu\delta \leq t < (\nu+1)\delta, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ X''_{\delta,t} &= Y''_{\delta,\nu}, & J''_{\delta,t} &= H''_{\delta,\nu}, & \nu\delta \leq t < (\nu+1)\delta, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned}$$

It then holds that, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_{\delta,0}(\omega) \leq X''_{\delta,0}(\omega)$  and  $J'_{\delta,0}(\omega) = J''_{\delta,0}(\omega)$ ,

$$X'_{\delta,t}(\omega) \leq X''_{\delta,t}(\omega), \quad J'_{\delta,t}(\omega) = J''_{\delta,t}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We also define

$$\mathcal{G}'_{\delta,s} = \bigcup_{\alpha \geq \delta} \mathcal{F}'_{\alpha,s}, \quad \mathcal{G}''_{\delta,s} = \bigcup_{\alpha \geq \delta} \mathcal{F}''_{\alpha,s}, \quad \delta > 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}'_{\alpha,s}$  and  $\mathcal{F}''_{\alpha,s}$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , are the  $\sigma$ -algebras generated by  $\{(X'_{\alpha,u}, J'_{\alpha,u}); 0 \leq u \leq s\}$  and  $\{(X''_{\alpha,u}, J''_{\alpha,u}); 0 \leq u \leq s\}$ , respectively. Note here that  $\{(X'_{\delta,t}, J'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}$  is a semi-Markov process with the embedded Markov chain  $\{(X'_{\delta,\nu\delta}, J'_{\delta,\nu\delta}) = (Y'_{\delta,\nu}, H'_{\delta,\nu}); \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ . Thus, for  $s \in [\nu\delta, (\nu+1)\delta)$ ,  $t \in [(\nu+1)\delta, (\nu+2)\delta)$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P(X'_{\delta,t} = l, J'_{\delta,t} = j \mid X'_{\delta,s} = k, J'_{\delta,s} = i, \mathcal{G}'_{\delta,s}) \\ &= P(X'_{\delta,t} = l, J'_{\delta,t} = j \mid X'_{\delta,s} = k, J'_{\delta,s} = i) \\ &= p^{(\delta)}(k, i; l, j), \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It follows from (A.2) and (3.2) that, for all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P(X'_{\delta,t} = l, J'_{\delta,t} = j \mid X'_{\delta,s} = k, J'_{\delta,s} = i, \mathcal{G}'_{\delta,s}) \\ &= P(X'_{\delta,t} = l, J'_{\delta,t} = j \mid X'_{\delta,s} = k, J'_{\delta,s} = i) \\ &= p^{([n_{\delta,t} - n_{\delta,s}]\delta)}(k, i; l, j), \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $n_{\delta,t} = \sup\{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+; n\delta \leq t\}$ . Similarly, for all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X''_{\delta,t} = l, J''_{\delta,t} = j \mid X''_{\delta,s} = k, J''_{\delta,s} = i, \mathcal{G}_{\delta,s}'') \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X''_{\delta,t} = l, J''_{\delta,t} = j \mid X''_{\delta,s} = k, J''_{\delta,s} = i) \\ &= p^{([n_{\delta,t}-n_{\delta,s}]\delta)}(k, i; l, j), \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We now define

$$\begin{aligned} \{(X'_t, J'_t); t \geq 0\} &= \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \{(X'_{\delta,t}, J'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}, \\ \{(X''_t, J''_t); t \geq 0\} &= \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \{(X''_{\delta,t}, J''_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (A.1) that, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_0(\omega) \leq X''_0(\omega)$  and  $J'_0(\omega) = J''_0(\omega)$ ,

$$X'_t(\omega) \leq X''_t(\omega), \quad J'_t(\omega) = J''_t(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Recall here that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is regular and thus  $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \mathbf{P}^{(\delta)} = \mathbf{I}$  (see subsection 3.1). Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \mathbf{P}^{([n_{\delta,t}-n_{\delta,s}]\delta)} = \mathbf{P}^{(t-s)}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It follows from (A.3)–(A.5) and the continuity of probability [5, Chapter 1, Theorem 1.1] that, for all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X'_t = l, J'_t = j \mid X'_s = k, J'_s = i, \cup_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{G}_{\delta,s}') \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X'_t = l, J'_t = j \mid X'_s = k, J'_s = i) \\ &= p^{(t-s)}(k, i; l, j), \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ & \mathbb{P}(X''_t = l, J''_t = j \mid X''_s = k, J''_s = i, \cup_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{G}_{\delta,s}'') \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X''_t = l, J''_t = j \mid X''_s = k, J''_s = i) \\ &= p^{(t-s)}(k, i; l, j), \quad (k, i), (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that, by definition,  $\{(X'_t, J'_t)\}$  and  $\{(X''_{\delta,t}, J''_{\delta,t})\}$  are regular-jump processes. As a result,  $\{(X'_t, J'_t)\}$  and  $\{(X''_{\delta,t}, J''_{\delta,t})\}$  are regular-jump Markov chains characterized by the common transition matrix function  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)}$  and thus by the infinitesimal generator  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Lemma A.2 (Pathwise ordering from the block-wise dominance)** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{Q} \prec_d \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and either  $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \in \text{BM}_d$ . Under these conditions, the following are true.*

- (a) *If  $N < \infty$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  are bounded infinitesimal generators, then there exist two regular-jump Markov chains  $\{(X'_t, J'_t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{X}'_t, \tilde{J}'_t); t \geq 0\}$  with infinitesimal generators  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ , respectively on a common probability space  $(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \Omega)$  such that*

$$X'_t(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_t(\omega), \quad J'_t(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_t(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

*for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_0(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_0(\omega)$  and  $J'_0(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_0(\omega)$ .*

(b) If  $\tilde{Q}$  is regular, then statement (a) holds without  $N < \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma A.2.* We first prove statement (a). Since  $Q$  and  $\tilde{Q}$  are bounded infinitesimal generators, we can readily show that

$$\exp\{Qt\} \prec_d \exp\{\tilde{Q}t\},$$

in a way similar to the derivation of (3.29). Thus, we have  $P^{(t)} \prec_d \tilde{P}^{(t)}$ . Furthermore, since either  $Q \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{Q} \in \text{BM}_d$ , it follows from Lemma 3.2 that either  $P^{(t)} \in \text{BM}_d$  or  $\tilde{P}^{(t)} \in \text{BM}_d$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

We now fix  $\delta > 0$  arbitrarily. According to [18, Lemma A.2], we can construct two discrete-time Markov chains  $\{(Y'_{\delta,\nu}, H'_{\delta,\nu}); \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{Y}'_{\delta,\nu}, \tilde{H}'_{\delta,\nu}); \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$  with transition probability matrices  $P^{(\delta)}$  and  $\tilde{P}^{(\delta)}$ , respectively on the common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  such that, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $Y'_{\delta,0}(\omega) \leq \tilde{Y}'_{\delta,0}(\omega)$  and  $H'_{\delta,0}(\omega) = \tilde{H}'_{\delta,0}(\omega)$ ,

$$Y'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) \leq \tilde{Y}'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega), \quad H'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) = \tilde{H}'_{\delta,\nu}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We then define two stochastic processes  $\{(X'_{\delta,t}, J'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{X}'_{\delta,t}, \tilde{J}'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X'_{\delta,t} &= Y'_{\delta,\nu}, & J'_{\delta,t} &= H'_{\delta,\nu}, & \nu\delta \leq t < (\nu+1)\delta, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \tilde{X}'_{\delta,t} &= \tilde{Y}'_{\delta,\nu}, & \tilde{J}'_{\delta,t} &= \tilde{H}'_{\delta,\nu}, & \nu\delta \leq t < (\nu+1)\delta, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_{\delta,0}(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_{\delta,0}(\omega)$  and  $J'_{\delta,0}(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_{\delta,0}(\omega)$ ,

$$X'_{\delta,t}(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_{\delta,t}(\omega), \quad J'_{\delta,t}(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_{\delta,t}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \{(X'_t, J'_t); t \geq 0\} &= \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \{(X'_{\delta,t}, J'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}, \\ \{(\tilde{X}'_t, \tilde{J}'_t); t \geq 0\} &= \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \{(\tilde{X}'_{\delta,t}, \tilde{J}'_{\delta,t}); t \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $X'_0(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_0(\omega)$  and  $J'_0(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_0(\omega)$ ,

$$X'_t(\omega) \leq \tilde{X}'_t(\omega), \quad J'_t(\omega) = \tilde{J}'_t(\omega) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma A.1, we can readily prove that  $\{(X'_t, J'_t)\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{X}'_t, \tilde{J}'_t)\}$  are regular-jump Markov chains with infinitesimal generators  $Q$  and  $\tilde{Q}$ , respectively. As a result, statement (a) is proved.

As for statement (b), it follows from Lemma 3.4 (b) that  $P^{(t)} \prec_d \tilde{P}^{(t)}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore, we can prove statement (b) in the same way as the proof of statement (a). The details are omitted.  $\square$

## B Basic lemmas

This appendix presents basic lemmas, which are used in Section 5.

**Lemma B.1** *Suppose that  $\tilde{Q}$  is ergodic. If Assumption 5.2 holds, then*

$$\{M_t := e^{ct}v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}}; t \geq 0\}$$

*is supermartingale, where  $\tilde{\tau}_0 = \inf\{t \geq 0; \tilde{X}_t = 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\{(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t)\}$  is a time-homogeneous Markov chain, it suffices to prove that  $E_{(k,i)}[M_t] \leq v(k, i)$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}$ . Note that if  $(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{J}_0) = (0, i)$  then  $\tilde{\tau}_0 = 0$  and thus

$$E_{(0,i)}[M_t] = 0 < 1 \leq v(0, i), \quad i \in \mathbb{D},$$

where the last inequality is due to  $v \geq e$ .

In what follows, we prove that

$$E_{(k,i)}[M_t] \leq v(k, i), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{D}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Let  $\tilde{t}_n = \inf\{t \geq 0; \tilde{X}_t \geq n\}$ . It then follows from the ergodicity of  $\tilde{Q}$  that  $P(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{t}_n = \infty) = 1$  and  $\{\tilde{t}_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a nondecreasing sequence. Thus, using the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain

$$E_{(k,i)} \left[ v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{(k,i)} \left[ v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t, \tilde{t}_{n+1} > t\}} \right], \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{D}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We now define  $\mathbf{g}_t^{[1,n]} := (g_t^{[1,n]}(k, i))_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{[1,n]}}$  as a column vector such that

$$g_t^{[1,n]}(k, i) = E_{(k,i)} \left[ v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t, \tilde{t}_{n+1} > t\}} \right], \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{[1,n]}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $\mathbb{F}^{[1,n]} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{D}$ . We then have

$$\mathbf{g}_t^{[1,n]} = \exp\{\tilde{Q}^{[1,n]}t\} \mathbf{v}^{[1,n]}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where  $\tilde{Q}^{[1,n]} = (\tilde{q}(k, i; l, j))_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathbb{F}^{[1,n]}}$  and  $\mathbf{v}^{[1,n]} = (v(k, i))_{(k,i) \in \mathbb{F}^{[1,n]}}$ . Furthermore, from (5.2), we have  $\tilde{Q}_+^{\leq n} \mathbf{v}^{[1,n]} \leq -c \mathbf{v}^{[1,n]}$ , which leads to

$$\exp\{\tilde{Q}^{[1,n]}t\} \mathbf{v}^{[1,n]} \leq e^{-ct} \mathbf{v}^{[1,n]}.$$

Substituting this into (B.4) and using (B.3) yield

$$E_{(k,i)} \left[ v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t, \tilde{t}_{n+1} > t\}} \right] = g_t^{[1,n]}(k, i) \leq e^{-ct} v(k, i), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{[1,n]}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Applying (B.5) to (B.2), we obtain

$$E_{(k,i)} \left[ v(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{J}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\tau}_0 > t\}} \right] \leq e^{-ct} v(k, i), \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{D},$$

which shows that (B.1) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma B.2** *If Assumption 3.1 holds and  $\mathbf{Q}$  is irreducible, then, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(t)}(k, i) - \mathbf{p}^{(t)}(k, i) \right\| \\ & \leq 2 \int_0^t \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{>n}} |q(l, j; l', j')| du, \quad t \geq 0, (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

*Proof.* For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u \geq 0$  and  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}$ , let  $f_n^{(u)}(k, i)$  denote

$$\begin{aligned} f_n^{(u)}(k, i) &= \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(u)}(k, i) - \mathbf{p}^{(u)}(k, i) \right\| \\ &= \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} |{}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) - p^{(u)}(k, i; l, j)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

From the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(u+\delta)}(k, i) &= \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j), & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}, \\ \mathbf{p}^{(u+\delta)}(k, i) &= \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} p^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j), & (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}. \end{aligned}$$

Using these equations, we obtain, for  $\delta > 0$  and  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_n^{(u+\delta)}(k, i) &\leq \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) \right\| \\ &\quad + \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} |{}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) - p^{(u)}(k, i; l, j)| \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}} p^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j') \\ &= \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) \right\| + f_n^{(u)}(k, i), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where the last equality holds due to (5.1), (B.7) and  $\sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}} p^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j') = 1$ . Note here that

$${}_{(n)}p_n^{(0)}(l, j; l', j') = p^{(0)}(l, j; l', j') = \chi_{(l, j)}(l', j'), \quad (l, j), (l', j') \in \mathbb{F}.$$

This equation and the triangle inequality yield, for  $(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(0)}(l, j) \right\| + \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(0)}(l, j) \right\| \\ & = 2 \{1 - p^{(\delta)}(l, j; l, j)\} + 2 \{1 - {}_{(n)}p_n^{(\delta)}(l, j; l, j)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

It follows from Assumption 3.1 and Lemma 4.3 that both  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{Q}_n$  are stable and conservative and their respective transition matrix functions are continuous. Thus, we have [6, Theorem II.3.1]

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - p^{(\delta)}(l, j; l, j) &\leq \delta |q(l, j; l, j)|, & (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \\ 1 - {}_{(n)}p_n^{(\delta)}(l, j; l, j) &\leq \delta |{}_{(n)}q_n(l, j; l, j)|, & (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying these inequalities to (B.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) \right\| &\leq 2\delta \cdot \left\{ |q(l, j; l, j)| + |{}_{(n)}q_n(l, j; l, j)| \right\} \\ &\leq 4\delta \cdot |q(l, j; l, j)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (4.8). Note here that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{{}_{(n)}p_n^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j') - \chi_{(l, j)}(l', j')}{\delta} &= {}_{(n)}q_n^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j'), \quad (l, j), (l', j') \in \mathbb{F}, \\ \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{p^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j') - \chi_{(l, j)}(l', j')}{\delta} &= q^{(\delta)}(l, j; l', j'), \quad (l, j), (l', j') \in \mathbb{F}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{p}_n^{(\delta)}(l, j) - \mathbf{p}^{(\delta)}(l, j) \right\|}{\delta} = \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{q}_n(l, j) - \mathbf{q}(l, j) \right\|, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where  ${}_{(n)}\mathbf{q}_n(k, i) = ({}_{(n)}q_n(k, i; l, j))_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  and  $\mathbf{q}(k, i) = (q(k, i; l, j))_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}}$  for  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{F}$ . Combining (B.10) and (B.8), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u} f_n^{(u)}(k, i) \leq \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{q}_n(l, j) - \mathbf{q}(l, j) \right\|. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

From (4.8), we also have

$$\left\| {}_{(n)}\mathbf{q}_n(l, j) - \mathbf{q}(l, j) \right\| = 2 \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{> n}} |q(l, j; l', j')|, \quad (l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}.$$

Substituting this into (B.11) and using (5.1) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} f_n^{(u)}(k, i) &\leq 2 \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{> n}} |q(l, j; l', j')| \\ &= 2 \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} {}_{(n)}p_n^{(u)}(k, i; l, j) \sum_{(l', j') \in \mathbb{F}^{> n}} |q(l, j; l', j')|, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq n}. \quad (\text{B.12}) \end{aligned}$$

Note here that  $f_n^{(0)}(k, i) = \sum_{(l, j) \in \mathbb{F}} |\chi_{(k, i)}(l, j) - \chi_{(k, i)}(l, j)| = 0$ . As a result, integrating both sides of (B.12) with respect to  $u$  from 0 to  $t$ , we obtain (B.6).  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science under Grant No. 15K00034.

## References

- [1] W. J. Anderson. *Continuous-Time Markov Chains: An Applications-Oriented Approach*. Springer, New York, 1991.
- [2] A. L. Andrew, K. E. Chu, and P. Lancaster. Derivatives of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of matrix functions. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 14(4):903–926, 1993.
- [3] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, Second edition, 1999.
- [4] D. A. Bini, G. Latouche, and B. Meini. *Numerical Methods for Structured Markov Chains*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.
- [5] P. Brémaud. *Markov Chains: Gibbs Fields, Monte Carlo Simulation, and Queues*. Springer, New York, 1999.
- [6] K. L. Chung. *Markov Chains with Stationary Transition Probabilities*. Springer, Berlin, Second edition, 1967.
- [7] D. J. Daley. Stochastically monotone Markov chains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 10(4):305–317, 1968.
- [8] D. Gibson and E. Seneta. Monotone infinite stochastic matrices and their augmented truncations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 24(2):287–292, 1987.
- [9] A. G. Hart and R. L. Tweedie. Convergence of invariant measures of truncation approximations to Markov processes. *Applied Mathematics*, 3:2205–2215, 2012.
- [10] L. Hervé and J. Ledoux. Approximating Markov chains and V-geometric ergodicity via weak perturbation theory. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(1):613–638, 2014.
- [11] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, Paperback edition, 1990.
- [12] J. F. C. Kingman. A convexity property of positive matrices. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 12(1):283–284, 1961.
- [13] V. G. Kulkarni. *Modeling and Analysis of Stochastic Systems*. CRC Press, New York, Second edition, 2010.
- [14] G. Latouche and V. Ramaswami. *Introduction to Matrix Analytic Methods in Stochastic Modeling*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1999.

- [15] H. Li and Y. Q. Zhao. Stochastic block-monotonicity in the approximation of the stationary distribution of infinite Markov chains. *Stochastic Models*, 16(2):313–333, 2000.
- [16] Y. Liu. Augmented truncation approximations of discrete-time Markov chains. *Operations Research Letters*, 38(3):218–222, 2010.
- [17] D. M. Lucantoni. New results on the single server queue with a batch Markovian arrival process. *Stochastic Models*, 7(1):1–46, 1991.
- [18] H. Masuyama. Error bounds for augmented truncations of discrete-time block-monotone Markov chains under geometric drift conditions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 47(1):83–105, 2015.
- [19] H. Masuyama. Error bounds for augmented truncations of discrete-time block-monotone Markov chains under subgeometric drift conditions. Preprint arXiv:1506.01789, 2015.
- [20] S. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, Second edition, 2009.
- [21] A. Müller and D. Stoyan. *Comparison Methods for Stochastic Models and Risks*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 2002.
- [22] M. F. Neuts. *Structured Stochastic Matrices of M/G/1 Type and Their Applications*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1989.
- [23] H. C. Tijms. *A First Course in Stochastic Models*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 2003.
- [24] R. L. Tweedie. Truncation approximations of invariant measures for Markov chains. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 35(3):517–536, 1998.
- [25] D. Williams. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1991.
- [26] A. Zeifman, V. Korolev, Y. Satin, A. Korotysheva, and V. Bening. Perturbation bounds and truncations for a class of Markovian queues. *Queueing Systems*, 76(2):205–221, 2014.
- [27] A. Zeifman and A. Korotysheva. Perturbation bounds for  $M_t/M_t/N$  queue with catastrophes. *Stochastic Models*, 28(1):49–62, 2012.
- [28] A. Zeifman, Y. Satin, V. Korolev, and S. Shorgin. On truncations for weakly ergodic inhomogeneous birth and death processes. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science*, 24(3):503–518, 2014.